EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FROM PREMISES TO PERSONALITIES: THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION AND CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Tom J. Farer, a fellow of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, a distinguished professor of law at Rutgers University, and a former president of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States, has written an excellent article entitled, "A Gordian Knot for the Blue Ribbon Panel," published in the Los Angeles Times on July 21, 1983. This article sheds a good deal of light on the policies of the Reagan administration toward Central America.

For the benefit of the House, I enclose for the RECORD this article which states that the administration is seeking to shift attention from premises to policies.

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 21, 1983]

A GORDIAN KNOT FOR THE BLUE-RIBBON PANEL

(By Tom J. Farer)

The appointment of Henry A. Kissinger to head a study commission on Central America is already benefiting the Reagan Administration by shifting the focus of the policy debate from premises to personalities. This is advantageous because President Reagan's policy to date has been built on premises that are incompatible. If this fact were to penetrate sufficient skulls on Capitol Hill and in the media, Reagan would experience the drafty feeling that is historically associated with naked emperors.

According to the President, U.S. policy toward El Salvador is premised on the need to promote democracy and human rights and the concurrent need to destroy the government's armed opposition. This premise is analogous to President Harry S. Truman's defense of the post-World War II Marshall Plan: By means of a major transfer of capital we would bolster the ability of West European governments to resist electoral or extra-legal challenges from domestic communist movements, as well as pressure from Moscow.

In that case, the goals of bolstering governments and promoting humane and democratic societies were compatible for the obvious reason that the incumbents already presided over democratic political systems. In El Salvador, by contrast, real power lies with an institution, the military, that has spent the last 60 years demonstrating contempt for democracy and ferocious hostitility to human rights.

Nominally, of course, El Salvador has a civilian president. According to its constitution it also has an independent judiciary. And just as the president does not govern, the courts do not judge. The real judicial system is the one that keeps the morgues supplied with mutilated cadavers, just as the real system of governance is the network of alliances that unite different factions of the officer corps into a fraternity that is dedicated to the advancement of its members.

For decades El Salvador's military academy has been the portal through which ambitious middle-class lads with strong stomachs and flexible morals pass to achieve upward mobility. Like Anastasio Somoza's Nicaraguan National Guard, they have functioned not as a national army defending interests common to all social groups but as a private one defending the interests of the few—namely themselves and their country's unusually small and conspicuously opulent oligarchy. Hence the natural astonishment of most observers in 1979 when younger officers suddenly expelled their seniors and initiated what, if it were fully implemented, would become the most far-reaching agrarian reform in any Latin American country outside Cuba.

To some this turnabout seemed inexplicable in any terms other than some form of divine intervention. Agnostics, however, detected rather more pedestrian forces at work—in particular the force always preeminent in the life of institutions—self-interest. Only a few months earlier, the seemingly invulnerable Nicaraguan National Guard had fallen, scattering its members into exile or incarceration and demonstrating that Washington's guarantee of right-wing regimes was no longer in effect.

Shewder Salvadoran officers saw in the ruins of the Nicaraguan guard the auguries of their own destruction. For in 1979 El Salvador was experiencing the same process of social mobilization and polarization that had rapidly achieved critical massiveness in Nicaragua. With the aid and encouragement of the Roman Catholic Church, workers and peasants were organizing to demand rights and to resist repression. Frustrated by the military's theft of elections and its harassment of democratic political organizations, despairing of any electoral means for breaking the country's feudal mold, reformist elements in the growing middle class were coming increasingly to accept guerrilla war as the only exit from their hell. Of course, they had not yet seen the disillusioning breakdown of the anti-Somoza coalition in neighboring Nicaragua.

Subsequent events have confirmed the theory that self-preservation was the main impulse for reformist sentiment in El Salvador's armed forces. The momentum quickly subsided when the United States reemerged as the champion of established governments in Central America against assaults from the left. And the gears of social change ground into reverse after Reagan and former Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig Jr. verbally transformed Central America into a main front of the new Cold War, with all that this implied in terms of commitment from Washington.

It may be, as some people allege, that within El Salvador's armed forces are officers who are opposed to indiscriminate butchery and sympathetic to economic and social reform. Although it stretches the imagination, I will also concede the possibility of some officers prepared, after a century or more of power, to subordinate the armed forces to democratic authority. But even assuming (against a good deal of contrary evidence) that such men do exist, it is still depressingly apparent that the first loyalty of the great majority is to the unity of the military institution. Unity means tolerance, and tolerance means that officers with a taste for butchery in the service of their personal interests or fascist ideals will continue to have a free hand.

In the 20th-Century history of the Salvadoran armed forces, only the fear of defeat for the entire structure has proved to be a sufficient force to rupture its unity. The U.S. Congress has, in effect, tried to use that fear by threatening to terminate aid unless certain conditions are met. But the threat is frightening only as long as there is a respectable armed opposition. In other words, the guerrillas are the only real leverage that U.S. policy-makers now have on the Salvadoran armed forces. If the guerrillas are defeated, the leverage goes.

It therefore follows that the Administration's declared interest in achieving democracy and the reign of human rights in El Salvador is incompatible with its interest in winning what it characterizes as a proxy battle with the Soviet Union. An equilibrium of forces is a necessary, though not sufficient, condition for the birth of democracy on that killing ground.

If past is prologue for Kissinger, as it is for most people, he will attempt to throw tha commission's support behind policies that subordinate all other interests to the end of military victory. That is, one would assume, why he was chosen. We can only hope, against all probability, that the White House has mistaken its man.●

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 118

HON. LES AuCOIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 28, the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, chaired by Mr. PERKINS, held a hearing on House Concurrent Resolution 118.

House Concurrent Resolution 118, which I introduced last April, reaffirms the sense of Congress that the Federal Government has an important role to play, in partnership with State and local governments, to support public education in the United States.

I was pleased to have Congressman TIM WIRTH join me to testify in favor of the legislation. In his testimony,

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. WIRTH outlined the areas where the Federal Government has a role to play in the education of our Nation's students. He stressed that our Nation is entering the information age, a revolution unlike any we have seen since the industrial revolution earlier this century. Responding to the needs of our Nation as this revolution develops and expands must be one of the top priorities of our education system and Federal education efforts.

In addition, we must continue to fight the budget battles at the Federal level for those programs that insure equal opportunity. We must not let up on the battle for equal rights. We must continue to take an active role in insuring quality education for all students.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD the testimony of my colleague, Mr. WIRTH. I hope that others will find it useful as the Congress continues to debate the Federal role in support of education.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE TIMOTHY E. WIRTH, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON TELECOMMUNICATIONS, CONSUMER PROTECTION AND FINANCE

Chairman Perkins, Members of the Committee. Thank you for giving me a few minutes to address the Committee as it explores a very timely question—what is the Federal Government's role in the education of our children?

There is little disagreement that we have entered the "information age," a revolution as far reaching—if not more so—than the industrial revolution that transformed our nation a century ago.

I refer to it as a revolution, but I wonder if we are ready. The National Commission on Excellence in Education declared in its recent report that America's schools are losing the battle of preparing our young people for the sure challenge of living and working—indeed, with coping—in the "information age." This is not necessarily the case in other industrialized nations.

Much has already been written about an American workforce that is increasingly illiterate; of students unable to draw inferences from written material; or solve mathematical problems involving several steps. This will certainly hinder us as we try to compete in the "information age."

Despite these trends, public opinion polls have consistently demonstrated that the public views paying for education as an investment in the most useful, and flexible, resource we possess—the mind. And this has been true since after another revolution—ours. The Continental Congress, recognizing the value of education, stipulated in the Land Ordinance of 1785 that one square mile of every township in each new state should be set aside "for the maintenance of public schools within said township."

Ever since then, our education system has always responded to a challenge. During the 1800's our land grant colleges and universities provided the training to develop our natural resources; in the early part of this century our educational system absorbed huge numbers of immigrants, many of whom spoke no English, and educated them and their children into productive citizenship. And more recently our universities have prepared the scientists and technicians that have allowed us to escape the gravity of earth and explore the universe.

But despite these triumphs, international comparisons of student achievement completed a decade ago revealed that on 19 academic tests American students were never first or second, and in comparison with other industrialized nations, were often last.

The need to reverse this trend is urgent. The Commission on Excellence noted that: "What was unimaginable a generation ago has begun to occur—others are matching and surpassing our educational attainments."

The result is that America's competitive posture in some international markets is beginning to slip away, and in some cases with a speed that practically defies the laws of physics.

For example, for more than two decades, American firms dominated the computer-chip industry. Three years ago, though, the Japanese delivered a powerhouse right to the American computer-chip industry by capturing control of the world market for memory chips known as 64K dynamic RAM—the most powerful memory chip in use, and vital components to larger computers.

If we are to maintain and expand our place in an increasingly competitive international economy we will have to tackle a new problem that teeters on the edge of becoming a fatal epidemic—technical illiteracy.

Consider for a moment, if you will, that nine of ten new jobs created today are in the information industry. Significantly, of ten new jobs created today, seven are filled by women. Some estimate that by 1990 there will be 30,000,000 jobs in computer-related fields.

We simply are not ready.

The purpose of your hearing today—to examine the role of the Federal Government in education—is particularly germane as the President continues his recent and rather odd campaign as the champion of the classroom. His solutions to the problem—funding cuts, tuition tax credits, and abolition of the Department of Education—would do more to retard education in this country than if we ignored the problem altogether.

State and local government bear the primary responsibility for education. However, the Federal Government has a significant role in complementing and enhancing those responsibilities.

Education must remain a top national priority at the Federal level.

Mr. Chairman, during the last two-and-one-half years you and the other members of this Committee have led the fight to preserve the universality of educational opportunity for our nation's young. I was proud to lend some assistance from my seat on the Budget Committee last year as you courageously took on the Administration's deep and short-sighted cuts in such programs as Title I, Head Start, and financial aid for college students who otherwise could never reach their potential.

In my role as Chairman of the Telecommunications subcommittee, I have been exploring yet another problem in education today: the impact of television on our young people and their learning.

We know that many children spend more time in front of the television set than they spend in the classroom. According to one estimate, by the time a child reaches age 16, he or she will have watched between 10,000 to 15,000 hours of television. Data demonstrates unequivocably that for large groups of children a negative correlation exists between the amount of television watched and declining verbal skills.

This need not be the case. Television is the most powerful educational tool available to us today, and probably for a long time. Programs like Sesame Street and 3-2-1 Contact have proven conclusively that television can be a positive factor in education.

The opportunity that television represents to help improve education is an extraordinarily exciting one that Congress should address.

In that spirit—to make this nation technically literate—I will be introducing into the Congress the Computer Literacy Act of 1983, a bill designed to provide access to the learning of computer skills for every child in America. The bill will:

(1) Provide funds to purchase computer hardware for schools;

(2) Establish teacher training institutes modeled after the institutes created by the National Defense Education Act, and encourage the development of model software;

(3) Call upon the National Institute of Education and the National Science Foundation to evaluate existing hardware and software, and disseminate this information to our nation's schools.

The keys to success of this program are access and equal opportunity. While schools which have a great deal of money are quite advanced in their education of computers, poorer districts are falling further and further behind, or being left out altogether, risking the potential of never participating in the information age in any way that could be considered meaningful.

Thank you.●

RAYMOND ROEBUCK

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1983

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to the chorus which has praised Raymond Roebuck today in the House of Representatives. As you well know, I am a relatively new Member of the House, coming here in June 1981 after a special election in my district. This can be a somewhat intimidating place for a newcomer, even to one with previous experience in an elected body, such as I had. But from the first time I set foot in the Democratic cloakroom, some 25 months ago, Raymond Roebuck put me at my ease.

His charm, his wit, and his tremendous sense of humor has carried not only him but all of us through some pretty tense and difficult moments. We all know that from time to time this chaotic thing called Democratic debate can create some occasional short-temperedness. But Raymond Roebuck sees us through, often soothing our spirits before sending us out into the fray once again.

The sense of dedication and positive spirit that Raymond Roebuck has offered to the Members of this body for the past 20 years is commendable. I am extremely pleased that I could be

here today and show my appreciation to such a fine man.●

THE CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION (APSA)

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to take the opportunity to recognize the American Political Science Association congressional fellowship program which celebrates its 30th anniversary this year. It is the oldest such program on Capitol Hill that is designed to place highly skilled professionals from a wide spectrum of backgrounds in congressional offices for 9 months. The fellows work in much the same way as permanent staff members and greatly help Members perform their representational duties as well as lawmaking activities.

The program enables an invaluable exchange: at no cost, the fellows bring to Congress new insights, fresh ideas, and extensive knowledge and experience in many disciplines. They contribute their experience to the Congress in exchange for a firsthand learning experience of the legislative process. The fellows then relate this experience back to their colleagues in their professions and broaden the appreciation of the complex political and public policy process.

Since 1953 more than 1,000 political scientists, journalists, Federal executives, doctors, lawyers, and other professionals from this country as well as other nations have been sponsored by the American Political Science Association. The congressional fellowship program was originally begun with only six fellows. It now sponsors between 40 and 50 fellows each year, who are chosen by a highly competitive selection process.

In my own office I have had the privilege of working with several very capable and dedicated fellows. Presently Ms. Janis D. Kerrigan-Roberts, a technical assistant from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and Mr. John J. Madison, a senior planner from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, are working on my staff. They have done an outstanding job.

The fellows accept responsibilities with little or no guidance and skillfully carry them out. They have performed legislative research, helped generate policy ideas, drafted bills, analyzed legislation, written position papers and issue briefs, suggested policy initiatives, and met and represented me well with executive, interest, and constituent groups, staff members and colleagues.

While it is relatively easy to understand the formal organization and operation of Congress, understanding the legislative system as it actually functions is much more difficult. The picture is complicated by the existence of many informal and formal centers of power in the Congress and by the highly personal nature of much of the power wielded. Yet the fellows do get a sense of the behind-the-scenes maneuvering, horsetrading, negotiation, compromise, and informal arrangments and perform like experienced staff members.

The fellows have accomplished a great deal, acquired new insights, and honed some important skills. They can return to their professions secure in the knowledge of a job well done.

I sincerely hope the program will continue because we all benefit enormously from it. I am grateful to have had the opportunity to have been part of the program. I seriously urge my colleagues to contact the American Political Science Association and request the assignement of a fellow to their staffs.●

SUMMARY OF NATURAL GAS BILL REPORTED BY THE ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE'S FOSSIL AND SYNTHETIC FUELS SUBCOMMITTEE ON JULY 29, 1983

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of our colleagues, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a summary of the natural gas legislation reported by the Energy and Commerce Committee's Fossil and Synthetic Fuels Subcommittee on July 29, 1983. This action took place at the 11th markup session, sessions which began on May 25. The 11 markup sessions followed 10 days of subcommittee hearings which began on March 16 and concluded on April 21. This legislation will be introduced as a clean bill and referred to the full Energy and Commerce Committee for its consideration. The material follows.

TITLE I: PIPELINE ACCOUNTABILITY:

1. Review standard: Expanded: Amend NGPA (Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978) to provide a definition of the term "abuse" (see Sec. 601(c) "fraud, abuse or similar grounds") as follows:

"The term "abuse" includes misrepresentation, imprudence on the part of the pipeline, failure by a pipeline to bargain at arms-length with any producer, and the entering into or operating pursuant to a contract if such contract materially prevents a response to changes in customer demand or other market forces." (Similar to Tauke bill, H.R. 705)

2. Hearing Requirement Established: When a protest of a purchased gas adjustment filing is made within 30 days of the filing of the PGA (purchased gas adjustment), the FERC (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission) shall hold a hearing on such protest within 60 days of the filing of the protest.

3. Pipeline Affiliate Sales Limited: Include Section 501 of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources bill, which would prohibit any interstate pipeline from selling to its affiliated instrastate pipeline, Hinshaw pipeline, or LDC (local distributing company) a greater percentage of the quantities of natural gas contractually available for sale during any month by the interstate pipeline to its affiliate than the percentage of contractually available lower priced gas which the affiliate buyer, i.e., the affiliate LDC is purchasing during the same month from non-affiliated interstate pipelines.

4. Pipeline Rate Design Established: The FERC shall not approve any Section 4 or 5 (Natural Gas Act of 1938) rate case until it first determines that the rate design component puts the pipeline at risk that it will not collect its allowed return on equity unless it manages its purchasing practices to meet the competition of alternative fuels while avoiding curtailments.

TITLE II: WELLHEAD PRICING:

1. "Old Gas" Not Deregulated: Provide that all pre-enactment Sec. 102(d), Sec. 103(c) [forever regulated], Sec. 104, Sec. 105 [forever regulated], and Sec. 106 contracts for natural gas shall be subject to the price controls of the NGPA.

2. "New Gas" Deregulated January 1, 1985: Other pre-enactment gas other than Sec. 102(d), Sec. 103(c) [forever regulated], Sec. 104, Sec. 105 [forever regulated], and Sec. 106 contracts shall be considered "new gas" and shall be subject to price controls of the NGPA until January 1, 1985, at which time it will be deregulated.

3. "New New Gas" Deregulated Upon Enactment: "New new gas" is any well spudded after the date of enactment.

4. Qualified Enhanced Recovery Gas Deregulated: Provide that the additional volumes produced from any well, old or new, which would not have been produced but for the implementation of a qualified enhanced recovery technique shall be deregulated. FERC shall be authorized to designate other qualifying techniques. The purchaser of the related gas shall have the exclusive option to elect to purchase the enhanced recovery gas for a period of 30 days; if the purchaser does not so elect, the producer may sell such enhanced recovery gas to any person and the first purchaser shall be obligated to transport such gas (at a just and reasonable rate.) Cross reference to contract carriage provision. If the purchaser and the producer agree, they may elect a new price for the entire production of the well so long as the purchaser is not affiliated with the producer.

5. Infill Drilling Incentive Established: Any well which is spudded after the date of enactment and which satisfies the requirements of Sections 102 and 103 shall be considered "new new" gas notwithstanding any contract for any other gas in the same field or reservoir.

6. Lowered Abandonment Pressure Incentive Established: If the productive life of a well can be extended by lowering the abandonment pressure and if the purchaser (not affiliated with the producer) agrees to authorize such extended production, the parties may agree to a new price notwithstanding NGPA.

7. Reimposition Authority Repealed: Provide that the authority of the President or the Congress to reimpose price controls on natural gas shall be repealed on the date of enactment.

8. "Natural Gas Price Indicator" Calculation: The Energy Information Administration shall calculate, on a quarterly basis, beginning four months after date of enactment, the average price of all gas contracts signed for "new new" gas as defined above.

TITLE III: CERTAIN CONTRACT TERMS

1. Statutory Take-or-Pay Reduced: For a period of three years, the take-or-pay provisions in existing contracts could be reduced to 50 percent at the option of the purchaser if their take-or-pay level is greater than 50 percent. Contracts for occluded gas from coal seams, for casinghead gas and for gas which would otherwise be lost through drainage are exempted from this take-or-pay reduction. (Take or pay provisions similar to Gephardt bill, H.R. 2154)

2. Gas to National Market Released: Any volume of natural gas which was under contract on the date prior to enactment shall be deemed to be deregulated and released for sale to any purchaser (no longer considered "commited and dedicated"; no abandonment proceedings necessary) to the extent that the particular volume was subject to:

A. The claim of force majeure;

B. Reduction in volume to 50 percent under the statutory take or pay provision (i.e., 50 percent taken, 50 percent released);

C. Other device which results in 50 percent or less of the original maximum take being taken or paid for by the original purchaser.

3. 30-Day First Option to Acquire Released Gas Established: Original purchasers of released natural gas shall be entitled to an exclusive option to acquire any such volumes for a period of 30 days immediately following date of release. After that 30-day first option period expires, the original purchaser has 15 days, upon presentation by the producer of a bona fide offer, to match the producer's best offer. If the purchaser fails to match the offer within 15 days, the producer may sell the gas to his offeror rather than the original purchaser.

4. Price Escalators Limited: Upon deregulation, automatic price escalators shall not operate to establish a contract price if such price would exceed the average of all contracts for the sale of "new new gas" for the preceding 3 months (NGPI). (Does not apply to "new new" or already deregulated gas contracts.)

5. Minimum Bills Limited: Contract and tariff requirements which obligate a pipeline customer to purchase a given volume of gas (minimum bills) shall (1) be reduced automatically if such pipeline receives take-or-pay relief or other reduction in volumes from its producers or other pipeline suppliers and (2) may be ignored by either party for a period of twelve months beginning six months after the date of enactment. At the end of that period, if either party has elected not to be bound by the minimum bill, further enforcement of the minimum bill is against public policy.

TITLE IV: NATURAL GAS ACCESS TO SUPPLIES AND TO TRANSPORTATION:

1. National Supply Market Creation: Allow all purchasers the ability to purchase all available gas supplies (without local gas distributors or intrastate pipelines being subject to FERC jurisdiction). [Sections 401, 402 from Administration bill, H.R. 1760]

2. Contract Carriage/National Transportation Market Created: Provide that interstate pipelines shall be able to earn just and reasonable compensation for transporting natural gas owned by others and that FERC shall order such transportation services where a rebuttable presumption that transportation capacity exists cannot be overturned. FERC shall provide rules for transportation rates, including the creation of an incentive compensation rate for pipelines. Intrastate pipelines shall be subject to similar rules to be administered by agencies of the States. Local distribution companies shall not be regulated by FERC. In addition, interstate pipelines shall not be authorized to serve directly the current industrial customers of local distribution companies unless FERC determines it is "in the public convenience and necessity". (Similar to Corcoran-Simon bill, H.R. 2565)

TITLE V: NATURAL GAS USE: RESTRICTIONS PROVISIONS:

1. Repeal the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978 in large part in order to reopen important markets for natural gas.

2. Repeal Incremental Pricing (Title II of NGPA).

TITLE VI: IMPORTED GAS PROVISIONS:

1. Provide for the revocation of an import license for imported natural gas whose price has not been renegotiated such that it is market responsive within nine months after enactment. (Similar to Corcoran-Wolpe bill, H.R. 1441)●

NATIONAL PARALYZED VETERANS RECOGNITION DAY

HON. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, this Nation owes a debt that can never be repayed sufficiently. A debt to the veterans who answered a call, served with honor, valiantly fought and made many sacrifices to maintain the security of this Republic. Today we focus attention on those sacrifices and the accomplishments of all veterans by honoring those who have experienced spinal cord injury or dysfunction, the Nation's paralyzed veterans.

The President has signed a proclamation declaring today "National Paralyzed Veterans Recognition Day." This day will serve as a tool to help overcome one of the greatest obstacles faced by paralyzed veterans (and by catastrophically disabled persons), a lack of public awareness and understanding of their needs and capabilities.

There are approximately 25,000 spinal cord injured veterans in this country, of which about 12,000 belong to a congressionally chartered veterans' service organization, Paralyzed Veterans of America. This fine organization, which has served paralyzed veterans and handicapped Americans for over 37 years, maintains programs in service, research, advocacy, and legislation to serve the needs of this distinguished group.

I commend my colleague, the Honorable JOE MOAKLEY of Massachusetts, for introducing the resolution, which I am proud to have cosponsored, that sets aside August 3 as a day of commemoration, a day of tribute, a day of appreciation for the deeds and sacrifices of our paralyzed veterans.

I am also pleased to see that the U.S. Postal Service will issue a special commemorative stamp today honoring those veterans who have suffered paralysis, either as a result of service in the military or from nonservice related causes. It is deserved recognition.

It is said that to be paralyzed is to be rendered helpless. Nothing could be less true. Our paralyzed veterans are useful, productive citizens; and they still have many contributions to make.

I would ask my colleagues and every American to join with me on this special day to show our appreciation for the freedoms we enjoy and the men and women who defended them. To the Nation's paralyzed veterans, your sacrifices and your successes have not gone unnoticed.●

IN MEMORIAM TO HON. ULDRIC L. FIORE OF NEW JERSEY

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday August 3, 1983

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 21, 1983, a distinguished citizen, esteemed administrator of justice, and good friend, the Honorable Uldric L. Fiore, went to his eternal rest leaving a magnificent legacy to our people of a beloved judge filled with compassion and benevolence for his fellowman and an exemplary record in public service on their behalf. I respectfully request that you and our colleagues here in the Congress join with me in silent prayer to his memory and extend our most sincere condolences to his good wife, Virginia; their son, Capt. Uldric L. Fiore of Washington, D.C.; their daughter, Robin Bischoff of Lincoln Park, N.J.; his father, Nicholas of Bloomfield, N.J.; two brothers, Benedict of Stuart, Fla. and John of Irvine, Calif.; and sister, Concetta Monaco of Bloomfield, N.J.

Mr. Speaker, the richness of wisdom and sincerity of purpose that Judge Uldric Fiore has imparted to our people are mirrored in his many accomplishments and warmth of his friendship that have won him the confidence and support of all of us who have had the good fortune to know him.

Uldric Lutgardt Fiore was born in Newark, N.J. on November 22, 1915. He attended local elementary and sec-

ondary schools and completed the general curriculum course of studies at State teachers college and was successful in obtaining the following prestigious degrees from Rutgers, the State University:

Bachelor of Science in Education, May 24, 1941.

Bachelor of Laws, June 13, 1948.

Juris Doctor, March 8, 1968.

Mr. Speaker, we are deeply appreciative of his service to our country in the armed services during World War II from August 1942 to May 1946, Army first lieutenant, honorably discharged and captain, U.S. Army (regular), inactive reserves.

Before embarking on his career in the legal profession Uldric Fiore was a well-respected educator in the New Jersey school system. Upon his graduation from Rutgers Law School, he was successful in his quest for membership with the New Jersey Bar and was admitted to practice law, as follows:

Admitted to New Jersey Bar, May 1949.

The Supreme Court of New Jersey, August 13, 1953.

The United States Court of Claims, March 8, 1961.

The United States Supreme Court, Washington, D.C., March 30, 1955.

The Federal District Court, Newark, N.J., May 6, 1949.

The United States Court of Appeals, October 1, 1956.

The United States Department of Justice, Board of Immigration Appeals, December 20, 1950.

The Tax Court of the United States, Washington, D.C., February 3, 1953.

After serving his clerkship for 2 years in Montclair, N.J., Dr. Fiore remained in Montclair as an attorney in general practice for 10 years. He then relocated to Ringwood, N.J. where for over three decades his personal commitment to the economic, social, and cultural enhancement of our community became a way of life for him.

During the period 1950 to 1982 he held various offices of public trust in the borough of Ringwood. We are especially proud of his many years of outstanding service as the attorney for the Board of Education of the borough of Ringwood. He was also legal adviser to the borough's Planning Board and the first counsel to the Passaic County Community College where he assisted in acquiring the land on which the college now stands. He also served as planning board attorney for the borough of Wanaque for 5 years.

Judge Fiore was a magistrate in Ringwood Municipal Court for a total of 16 years. In 1955 he was appointed magistrate of the borough where he served for 10 years. He was reappointed as magistrate of Ringwood on January 1, 1975 and again on January 1, 1979 until he retired from the bench at the end of 1981.

Some of his additional affiliations with professional and civic organizations and in public service to our people included:

The Essex County Bar Association.

The Passaic County Bar Association.

The State Bar Association.

Immigration Committee.

Municipal Ordinance Review Committee.

Magistrates and Judicial Committees.

Masonic Blue Lodge, ASHLAR Lodge No. 10, Douglas, Wyo.

New Jersey Consistory, Northern Valley.

Salaam Temple, Livingston, N.J.

Tall Cedars of Lebanon, Sloatsburg, N.Y.

Ringwood Square Club, Ringwood, N.J.

Pompton Lakes Elks Lodge No. 1895, Pompton Lakes, N.J.

American Legion, Wanaque Memorial Post, Wanaque, N.J.

Erskine Lakes Volunteer Fire Company (25-year member), Ringwood, N.J.

Italian Circle of Paterson, N.J.

Ringwood Rotary Club, past president and charter member.

Ringwood Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Fiore's having been called to his eternal rest at the young age of 67 years culminated a lifetime scroll of good works and dedication to the needs of people. There is much that can be said about him and his endless energy and unending devotion in ever seeking the highest standards of excellence on behalf of our people. These good deeds can be best expressed by the public recognition he received from some of our Nation's most prestigious citizens organizations. He was particularly proud of the personal citations of appreciation that he received from the following organizations:

The International Legal Fraternity of Phi Delta Phi (1950).

Ringwood Rotary Club (1961 and 1982).

Passaic County Magistrates Association (1964).

Italian Circle of Paterson (1971).

Just last year Judge Fiore received the most highly coveted honor of being chosen the "Paul Harris Fellow" of the Rotary Club of Ringwood—the highest award that Rotary can bestow upon any of its members. It is symbolic in eulogizing Uldric Fiore that we point to the motto of Rotary International, namely, "We make a living by what we get—we make a life by what we give—service above self." Uldric Fiore has by his example and lifetime of dedication to these same true American ideals personified exemplary leadership in his outstanding responsible service to our people.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to seek national recognition of a great American, the Honorable Uldric L. Fiore. His diligent dedication and sincerity of purpose in his quest for equality and justice for each and every citizen will forever serve as an inspiration to others in life's purpose and fulfillment. He will be sorely missed by all of us and I do trust that his family will soon find abiding comfort in the faith that God has given them and in the knowledge that there beloved husband, father, son, and brother, the Honorable Uldric L. Fiore, is now under His eternal care. May he rest in peace.●

RELIGIOUS REPRESSION IN NICARAGUA

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues two statements made at the White House recently on the subject of Nicaragua's repression of its Jewish community.

These statements were delivered by Rabbi Morton Rosenthal of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and Mr. Issac Stavisky, formerly of Nicaragua. They describe the actions of the Sandinistas, before and after their ascent to power, which have caused all of Nicaragua's Jews to leave their country.

Whether the Sandinistas are anti-Semites of their own volition, or whether they are merely repaying favors to their PLO supporters, the harassment of Jews is reprehensible. This behavior is consistent with the antireligious tenets of Communist doctrine, and with the pervasive actions the Sandinistas have taken against the Catholic Church.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who has entertained the belief that the Nicaraguan Government is benevolent and respectful of human rights would do well to examine its record on religious freedom. The Sandinista regime is a menace to the most fundamental rights and aspirations of man.

STATEMENT BY RABBI MORTON M. ROSENTHAL

I feel privileged to come before you today to speak about the plight of the Jews of Nicaragua and the activities of the Palestine Liberation Organization in Central America. I bring no policy recommendations, but I hope that my remarks will be useful to those who have such responsibility.

The Anti-Defamation League has long monitored PLO activity in the region. Our report on such activity reflects our conviction that a PLO presence represents a threat to the security of Jews. In the instance of Nicaragua, that has been validated by developments which led to the exile of the entire community and the confiscation of their properties, including the synagogue.

In a few minutes, a member of the Nicaraguan Jewish community will describe San-

dinist anti-Semitism. When Nicaraguan Jews came to ADL and told us that their being Jewish was a major factor in their forced exile and the loss of their properties, we made representations on their behalf, in 1981, to the Foreign Minister of Nicaragua. We hoped that through "quiet diplomacy" we could obtain clarification as to the reasons for the confiscations and the forced exiling of the Jewish community. After 19 months, having concluded that the government of Nicaragua was not going to respond to any of our questions, we publicized the plight of Nicaragua's Jews via the article entitled "Nicaragua Without Jews."

The reaction of officials of the Nicaraguan Government to inquiries and protests that were stimulated by that article has created a dilemma. Government spokesmen repeatedly assert that they have no policy of anti-Semitism. On the other hand, Nicaraguan Jews insist that anti-Semitism forced them to flee the country, thus creating the dilemma of whom to believe.

The dilemma is more apparent than real. We know of no laws in Nicaragua that are aimed specifically at Jews. There may well be no "official" policy of anti-Semitism. But, the Nicaraguan situation demonstrates that one does not need official policy in order to persecute a small community. It can be effected far more subtly by threat, intimidation and confiscation, thus avoiding the condemnation that Nuremberg-type laws would invite.

In attempting to decide whether the world can rely on the government of Nicaragua's assurances that there is no anti-Semitism, we might usefully consider how it handled the confiscation of the Synagogue.

The Jewish community of Nicaragua built a new synagogue in 1976, to replace the one that had been destroyed in the devastating earthquake of 1972. We repeatedly inquired about the synagogue's status, but received no reply. When we met with the Nicaraguan Ambassador in Washington last month, he refused even to acknowledge that there was a synagogue in Managua, saying only that it was a building owned by a private individual that was confiscated, along with his other assets.

Subsequently, we were informed, via a third party, that the government did not know that the building was a synagogue but it is now prepared to return it to the community. Unless Nicaraguan Jews are able to return to their country and recover their property, this is a meaningless gesture.

I have here a copy of a contract which was duly notarized in 1975, recording the purchase of the land for the purpose of building "A Jewish Temple" by "Congregation Israelita Del Nicaragua." The document lists the officers of the congregation and describes it as a legal entity with religious, cultural and social purposes.

Given the small size of the city of Managua, the contract, and the fact that the building has various architectural features which distinguish it as a synagogue, including the Star of David and stained glass, one must conclude that the government of Nicaragua has been less than candid.

Because the government has dissembled about the synagogue, we must necessarily doubt the reliability of government allegations against individual Jews, and others.

It is important to know that in almost all instances Jews were charged with being Somocistas or with selling arms were not given the benefit of a trial nor was proof brought forth to substantiate the accusations. The government's making the charge was sufficient to condemn the person. One man, however, had four trials; he won all of them. The case was then shifted to Managua, his lawyer disqualified and replaced by a court-appointed attorney. Within three days the government won and the properties were confiscated.

Historically, Jews of Nicaragua have not experienced major problems of anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism at the hands of the Sandinists cannot be traced to deep-rooted theological prejudice or long-standing cultural antipathy to Jews. The roots of contemporary anti-Semitism in Nicaragua are in the Middle East. There are three basic elements worth citing:

The Sandinists have had a long relationship with the PLO. As the ADL report indicates, Sandinists fought alongside the PLO in the Middle East in the early 1970's, and the PLO gave them entree to the Arab world from which they have received armaments and financing as well as political support. At the present time there is an officially recognized PLO office in Managua with its staff afforded full diplomatic status.

The objective of that PLO office, and other PLO offices in Latin America, is to fight against Israel. Their fight is also directed against the local Jewish communities, which are seen as sources of political and economic support for Israel. Sandinist anti-Semitism is an act of solidarity with the Arab world in its fight against Zionism and so-called imperialism.

A second factor is the historic relationship between Israel and the Somoza Government. When the newly-created State of Israel was fighting for its existence in 1948, General Somoza served as a source of desperately needed weapons. Israel later became a supplier of weapons for Somoza, which naturally angered the Sandanists and served as an additional motivation for their anti-Zionism.

The third factor is the inability or unwillingness to distinguish between Jews who are citizens of Israel and those who are citizens of Nicaragua. This phenomenon was summed up by the graffiti on the synagogue wall which said, "Judaism, Zionism and Somoza—the same thing."

From their base in Nicaragua, PLO agents have spread their net of influence throughout the region, allied with the forces of revolution. This menace was cited by President Luis Alberto Monge shortly before he took office as President of Costa Rica last year. In El Salvador, Guatemala, Panama and Honduras the PLO and Libyan agents are spreading the venom of anit-Semitism. In conversation with leaders of Jewish communities in Central America I have learned that they are profoundly troubled by that which has happened to the Jews of Nicaragua. They know the implications, for them, of victory by the revolutionary Left in their respective countries, because of its solidarity with the PLO and radical Arab states, such as Libya, which are spending large amounts of money in Central America and Panama.

Historically, Jews have suffered greatly at the hands of despots of all political orientations. For this reason, they are particularly sensitive to the dangers of anti-Semitism. For the Jews of Central America, the signs are writ large that the influence of the PLO and Libya are a direct threat to their security and well-being.

STATEMENT BY MR. ISAAC STAVISKY

On behalf of all members of the Nicaraguan Jewish community, I wish to express our appreciation for your interest and thank you for this opportunity to speak about the suffering which we have experienced at the hands of the Sandinistas.

The Jewish community has always been small, numbering about 50 families at its peak. Jews began coming to Nicaragua in the late 1920's from Eastern Europe. They dedicated themselves to farming, manufacturing and retail sales and made significant contributions to the country's economic development.

Nicaraguan Jews never encountered anti-Semitism, unti the Sandinistas started their revolution. Even before the Sandinistas came to power they began threatening Jews. A favorite tactic was to anonymously phone Jewish homes with warnings that "We are going to get you Jews" claiming that we are responsible for the killing of our people by guns sold to the Somoza regime by Israel. Graffiti by Sandinistas was widespread, with attacks on Jews and their religion. One was "Death to the Jewish Pigs." The initials FSLN in red and black left no doubt as to who was responsible.

Once the Sandinistas came to power in July, 1979 they moved swiftly against Jews. Jewish owned properties were among the first to be confiscated and Jews were forced into exile.

A few specific cases might best illustrate the situation which we confronted.

Mr. Freddy Luft came to Nicaragua from Rumania after the Second World War, running away from the Russians. By hard work he became the owner of a textile plant and two retail stores, in partnership with Mr. Oscar Kellerman. Freddy Luft never participated in politics.

A young man by the name of Mauricio, who he appointed General Manager of his business, was a member of the Sandinista party. Mauricio was very active and used his position to have a valid excuse to stay around the synagogue and write down the license plates of the vehicles in which the Jews arrived for prayers. Mauricio warned Mr. Luft that as soon as the Sandinista Revolution took power, all his business would be confiscated and that he would be thrown in jail. A few weeks before the Sandinista victory, Mr. Luft went to the German Embassy in Managua and was evacuated with other members of the German community.

Mr. Max Najman, who was the Honorary Consul of the State of Israel, had to leave Nicaragua one year before the Sandinistas came to power. He fled because the Sandinista's clandestine radio had announced they would execute Max Najman because he was the Consul of Israel.

He left his plastics factory in the hands of his son, Jimmy. He ran the factory for approximately one year and then the Sandinistas came to this factory and plainly informed him that the plant was being confiscated. When he was handed the decree he noticed that it had been dated one year before. He protested, to no avail. He then approached the newspaper, La Prensa, which carried his complaint publicly. After that publication, the Sandinistas came looking for him, but he was fortunate enough to cross the border on foot to Costa Rica.

Mr. Abraham Gorn's factory was burned. When the Sandinistas came to power they collected the insurance money from London. While the fighting for power was going on, Mr. Gorn left Nicaragua. When the Sandinistas came to power, Mr. Gorn returned to Nicaragua because he felt that he had done no wrong to anyone. As soon as he returned, he was accused of stealing land and was sent to jail. Mr. Gorn was 70 years

old at that time. During the jail sentence he was made to sweep the streets.

After his release he went back to his business. He was running the factories for six months when the Sandinistas took away everything that belonged to him, forcing him to seek asylum in the Costa Rican Embassy where he remained until he was taken to Costa Rica in a private plane. The reason that the Sandinistas gave Mr. Gorn for the confiscation was that he had sold Israeli arms to Somoza. Since when do two governments need a civilian to make an arms deal?

The Sandinistas confiscated the synagogue. When they were asked by Rabbi Morton Rosenthal the reasons for such an act, the Sandinistas responded that the synagogue belonged to Abraham Gorn! This of course is not true; we have the deed that certifies that the synagogue belongs to the Jewish community of Nicaragua. It seems that the Sandinistas are creating the Gorn Case as an apparant parallel with the well known Dreyfus case.

Permit me some words about my personal situation. I, together with my brother-in-law, Mr. Saul Retelny, ran complex of factories manufacturing textiles and candy which employed at peaks, over 1,200 heads of families. For a period of 18 months prior to July, 1979 anonymous callers would contact Mr. Retelny and threaten his life and that of his wife. These calls came to his business office and to his home, now also confiscated, at all hours of the night. One favorite tactic was to call around three in the morning and tell my brother-in-law that I had been shot and killed! At the same time, I would get a telephone call claiming that my brother-in-law was shot and killed.

In addition, there were writings on the walls inside and outside the factories: "Death to the Jews; Isaac will be killed. Beware of Sandinista Justice." Dry runs of abduction attempts were made. In one instance, I was stopped, with my son inside the car, and at gun point my life was threatened. I was warned that my businesses were to be taken over when the Sandinistas came to power. Although Mr. Retelny and I were both born in Nicaragua, we never participated directly or indirectly, in politics.

In 1978, the Sandinistas sent a strong message to the entire community when the synagogue was attacked by five Sandinistas wearing face handkerchiefs. They set the building on fire, by throwing gasoline in the main entrance doors, shouting PLO victory slogans and anti-Jewish defamatory language. This direct attack on the synagogue showed the PLO influence on the Sandinistas. As the doors caught fire, two members of the community, at prayer during Sabbath Services, ran through a side door. The Sandinistas met them with a show of automatic weapons and ordered them inside.

The two men who were confronted by the Sandinistas as the synagogue doors burned were both survivors of Nazi concentration camps—Mr. Lazlo Gewurstz and Mr. Gyula Pinkes. This was a traumatic experience for them and other survivors, because it evoked terrible memories which they thought they had put behind them when they fled from Nazi terrors and found refuge in Nicaragua.

The Sandinistas threatened to take our property, and they did. They threatened our lives and for that reason we left our country. We want to return to Nicaragua and live with our fellow countrymen under a democratic government which respects human rights. We hope that we will be able to do that soon.

Permit me a final word of warning to Jews and other people of Central America. Beware of the Sandinistas threat.●

GOVERNORS CALL FOR SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY LEGISLATION

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Nation's Governors departed from their prepared agenda to take up the very important issue of the social security disability review process which their State employees administer for the Federal Government.

Since March of 1981, State disability agencies using stringent Federal guidelines have notified more than one-half million Americans that they no longer are disabled enough to receive their benefits. Although two-thirds of those who appeal the initial decision win back their benefits, the Social Security Administration insists that about 97 percent of the States' decisions are correct interpretations of the Federal disability determination guidelines. And of the people who do lose their benefits it is estimated that less than 20 percent will ever work again before they die. And for the one-fifth who are capable of finding work, their annual incomes average about half the earnings of a full-time minimum wage worker.

Yesterday, the National Governors Association unanimously adopted a resolution put forward by Gov. Bill Clinton of Arkansas calling on the Congress to pass remedial legislation to correct the abuses in the current system. Governor Clinton is one of the five Governors who have appeared or submitted testimony before the House Select Committee on Aging in Washington or at field hearings over the last few months. The committee has documented, and the National Governors Association has confirmed, that many of the Nation's Governors will no longer allow their employees to comply with the overly strict review procedures thrust on them by the administration's review process. Gov. John Carlin of Kansas, who will assume chairmanship of the National Governors Association next summer, Gov. Michael Dukakis of Massachusetts, and Govenor Clinton have already ordered their States to reopen the cases of persons whom their State agencies have previously terminated. No doubt other Governors will follow, unless the Federal courts act more quickly as they already have in the West and Midwest where SSA is under order to reinstate benefits in about 15 States, including my State of California.

Mr. Speaker, the Governors have asked the Congress to act quickly on legislation. The bill which is being marked up by the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security contains many of the provisions which the Governors agreed to advocate. For instance, the Governors' resolution and the subcommittee's draft bill include support for the idea of face-to-face contract between a disability examiner and a beneficiary at the initial State decision level. Since this may have significant impact on how State disability agencies function, it is important to have the Governors' clear statement of support for such a change.

I compliment the subcommittee and its chairman, JAKE PICKLE, for taking action to prevent future abuses. I think we should all support the provisions which were contained in Chairman PICKLE's original draft bill. It is unfortunate that financial constraints may lead to a bill which does less than we should. I also hope we can provide some redress of the grievances done to the half-million persons already terminated, so that individual Governors and Federal courts will not have to make ad hoc corrections on a State-by-State basis.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that we have scheduled fewer than 20 legislative working days to pass any corrective legislation before the October 1 expiration of the authority for benefits to be paid during appeal. Since it is unlikely that we can enact comprehensive legislation prior to the October 1 deadline. I renew my call to Secretary Heckler to impose an across-the-board moratorium on the accelerated reviews pending the passage of the legislation being fashioned by Mr. PICKLE's Social Security Subcommittee. I also hope she will devise a way to insure that the advantages inherent in the bill are made available to those half-million former beneficiaries whose benefits are currently threatened or were already terminated under the current process.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment and congratulate Governor Clinton of Arkansas for his initiative in carrying this issue through considerable organizational barriers to the National Governors Association and for his efforts in securing its passage. I insert the text of the National Governors Association resolution, to be printed following my remarks.

NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION

The National Governors Association recognizes that the Social Security Disability Insurance Program provides critically needed support for the disabled people in our nation. While the goal of assuming that only those eligible actually continue to receive benefits is laudable, currently large numbers of people in our nation are experiencing hardships due to terminations of in-

dividuals or family members who cannot be reasonably expected to return to work.

This situation has been of great concern to the states which administer the program under policies and regulations established by the Social Security Administration. Some progress has been made as a result of interim measures adopted by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. However, the National Governors Association supports remedial legislation and calls upon Congress to enact pending legislation for the Social Security Disability Program that will:

1. Permanently continue Social Security Disability benefits through the Administrative Law Judge level in all Continuing Disability Investigation cases;

2. Adhere to a medical improvement standard before terminating benefits once initial eligibility is established;

3. Publicly promulgate policies and regulations affecting the determination of disability;

4. Require SSA to apply decisions of the circuit courts of appeal, or appeal those decisions with which it disagrees;

5. Provide for face-to-face evidentiary interviews at the initial decision level;

6. Provide for a temporary moratorium on mental impairment reviews until such time as the listings for mental impairment have been revised.●

PRESENCE IN NICARAGUA UNWANTED, SAYS AMERICAN STUDENT

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was sent to me by a constituent. The first-hand accounts coming back from Americans traveling, and working in Nicaragua have consistently said that our presence there and harassment of the Nicaraguan Government is unwanted, uncalled for and unnecessary.

Tom Frieden, the author of the letter, is a second year student at Columbia Medical School. He went to Nicaragua with a group of other medical students to learn about current programs for health delivery. After the tour, Tom stayed for 6 additional weeks to work with the Ministry of Health in rural clinics. Several years ago, Tom worked in my district office in New Rochelle. I commend his comments to the attention of my colleagues:

TOWN NEAR MANAGUA

I hope the press doesn't have you too worried, as things are quite stable here.

Everywhere we go we see people trying to make up for 150 years of dependency. The legacy is everywhere—from the American music and T-shirts to the hospitals that have only one entrance (they weren't meant for many people anyway) to the concentration of facilities in Managua, to the agricultural structure, based on export of cash crops, lack of education, lack of public facilities—and not through simple lack of resources, but through maldistribution.

"Poco a poco" we hear again and again—eradication of polio, encouragement of breast feeding, environmental sanitation, safe work, better traffic control, vaccination, regionalization of the health system, latrine building, aqueduct building. Even with the threat of war, which is omnipresent, progress is being made. For the first time, people have a say in how their workplace is run, and are taking control and pride in what is being done, so that even with resources almost as limited as existed under Somoza, people are doing infinitely more—consultations up 1,000 percent in the hospital in this town. More importantly, now people are genuinely trying to meet the needs of the mass of people. Above all, capitalist-dependent development in the Third World is about babies dying. Through inadequate nutrition, Aestlé marketing, poor water supplies and hygiene, lack of food and education, infections, etc. Before, babies starved routinely here—hardly a family had not lost at least one child. Now, intensive efforts are made to save each one. Before there was absolutely zero. Now, oral rehydration centers, breast feeding rooms, malnutrition recovery rooms—all of which are entirely new. Before, the people controlling health and other resources was no need to help the mass of the people.

Now the people in each clinic and hospital are working for their brothers and sisters and consultation, medicine, surgery are all free, even for the wealthy (who, however, usually go to private hospitals in Managua). They try to make conditions as good as possible for patients and family, as well as for workers. Still, staffing and equipment are grossly inadequate.

Dad, you should see the ICU at this hospital. One monitor and respirator, few drugs, 4 beds, a nurse and an aide—for 70,000 people. But they are building a new hospital. They could really use some advisors on setting up intensive care units!

The tour is over.

Please don't believe the lies in the NYT. Pastora has pulled out of the South, since he realizes that he had no support within the masses in Nicaragua. In the North, the contras and Honduras are focusing on one tiny area to try to take possession of some Nicaragua territory, and request international recognition. They have no support and are thoroughly hated. Nicaragua is an amazingly open and pluralistic society: free private enterprise, a sense of warmth in the streets (where I really do feel safer than I have in any city in the United States). Also, Nicaragua has made it clear that it will not establish any foreign military bases here—freedom from foreign domination was what the revolution was all about. Preparations for the 1985 elections proceed daily.●

JAPAN-UNITED STATES INTER-RELIGIOUS CONSULTATION

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit into the RECORD the report on the third Japan/United States Inter-Religious Consultation, held in Tokyo, May 17-23, 1983. Representatives from five world religions, Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Shintoism, met to discuss a wide range of vital issues. I think it is important to draw attention to meetings such as this one in order to recognize the vital importance of people-to-people contacts in promoting understanding among nations.

The report follows:

THE REPORT

"To be not like railroad tracks which run side by side and never meet, but like spokes of a wheel which separate yet are together in the center", said the old master.

DIALOGUE

Differences. Listening to others, expressing our own, then seeking a way to act together in diversity—this was the basis for the stimulating dialogue of the third World Conference on Religion and Peace, Japan/U.S. Inter-Religious Consultation, held in Tokyo, May 17-23, 1983.

Five world religions were represented: Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, Judaism, Shintoism. Delegates from WCRP/U.S. joined religious leaders from WCRP/Japan to discuss issues of economy and trade, politics and military defense, religion and culture. While expressing differing perceptions, delegates strengthened their understanding and joint resolve to make more effective and explicit their shared religious attitudes.

BACKGROUND AND OPENING: INTERDEPENDENCE AND INTER-RELATEDNESS OF ISSUES

Growing distrust between Japan and the United States colored the background of the Consultation. Distrust is manifested in material differences of trade and military expenditures. It is also at the core of misunderstandings and strained relationships among many nations in the world. Speaker after speaker emphasized the need of a global attitude, for an awareness of universal implications of comtemporary events.

Prayers by Shinto priests from Japan called the assembly to spiritual awareness by measured clapping of hands. "Grant us Peace", I prayed as the Jewish representative from the United States. WCRP/Japan President Nikkyo Niwano of the Rissho Kosei Kai (a modern movement in Buddhism) urged the assembly to change discord into accord by taking wider views rather than a more narrowed one on who is right. Reverend Kenryu T. Tsuji, President of WCRP/U.S. expressed wonder that our small planet is inhabited by persons with potential for wisdom, compassion and altruism.

Mt. Fuji, beautiful peaked cone capped with snow, was clearly visible to delegates and guests at a reception on the 28th floor of the Century Hyatt, the residence of U.S. attendees at the Consultation.

Caring attention to all details of setting and hospitality, including simultaneous translations, not only facilitated discussion but also created warmth of fellowship. Although differences were freely expressed, many emphasized the inter-relatedness of issues and the interdependence in the world of people and causes.

KEYNOTES

"More and more deeply-rooted injustice and hostilities, escalating cruelty . . . nuclear weaponry threatening the existence of human beings . . . mutual distrust," were notes sounded by Archbishop of Tokyo, Seiichi Shirayanagi. He spoke of the need to promote mutual dialogue and to think in a way that allows us to share a correct understanding of ownership to help people in desperate poverty.

Relations with Japan are not the highest priority for the United States, said Dr. Homer A. Jack, Secretary-General of WCRP/International. He spoke of the "universal dimensions of responsibility for human evil", underlining the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the Nazi holocaust. Noting rising overseas development assistance from both countries, he cited private nongovernmental overseas assistance, 22 cents per person in Japan, $5.84 per person in the United States. Dr. Jack marked the protectionism and trade gap between the developed and developing world, which no is greater than at the time of the second Japan/U.S. Consultation in 1972. Commending the recent United States Catholic Bishops' Pastoral Letter as a "magnificient encyclopedia relating to war and peace", he predicted a good future for democracy and civil rights in Japan and the United States.

Toasts and songs were shared at a lavish opening banquet.

FUMON HALL, RISSHO KOSEI KAI—INTRODUCTORY TALKS

Delegates convened in Fumon Hall, the Conference Center of Rissho Kosei Kai, the largest member organization of WCRP/Japan and host for the Consultation.

"Hope has become a very real issue today", I said as a Vice-President of WCRP/U.S. "It is a time of fear and uncertainty, challenging trust . . . yet we know the world is interdependent, that we need each other . . . and religious values are more important than ever, for religion encompasses all of life, the secular and the sacred." Speaking of the United Nations Declaration Against All Forms of Intolerance and Discrimination Based Upon Religion Or Belief, adopted by the General Assembly November 25, 1981, I referred also to U.N. Covenants and Conventions to foster greater awareness of the needs for human rights. "We need to find unity in our diversity . . . the integrating unifying force of our religious faiths".

"If democracy deteriorates, there is the spectre of Naziism and Fascism in Europe; in Asia there is little concept of democracy", said Professor Yoshiaki Iisaka, of Gakushuin University.

Nothing unemployment, rate of inflation and trade balance, as well as the fact that the United States and Japan have the largest Gross National Product (GNP) in the world, Professor Iisaka said that each nation has its own weaknesses, among them Japan's low self-sufficiency and the United States' high crime rate. He spoke of the communications gap between the two nations, with the U.S. news carrying less than one-fifth the stories about Japan in comparison with Japanese stories about the United States. In the United States, he said, it is difficult to find news of Japan unless it is crisis-oriented.

The fact that Japan is homogeneous ethnically and the United States heterogenous, contributes to their attitudes. There is in the two countries not only psychological and cultural differences but also ambivalence between admiration and suspicion. Professor Iisaka said that WCRP in Japan and in the United States needs a global perspective to promote a "trinitarian approach to peace: disarmament to eliminate all forms of violence, economic justice to eliminate poverty, human rights with a core of love."

Questions and discussion followed. Despite excellent simultaneous translation, there was the realization that language is a barrier. This intensified the need not only to listen to words but also to be sensitive to expressive modes of silence, pace, nonverbal communication. Suggesting differences, one delegate said that at a full moon-watching ceremony, Japanese brought food to sit and enjoy her beauty, while Americans brought binoculars to study her face.

TRADE AND ECONOMIC ISSUES

To stimulate our thinking, Reverend Robert Smylie of the United States delegation posed a number of "over-arching questions which are more cultural than technical. How does a society preserve its values of national power and security; freedom, with justice and compassion; growth, stability, success and self-reliance? How can the United States and Japan preserve their relations, given their diversity and tension? What can the two nations do to preserve a just social order, What can the religious community do, with its insights, attitudes and visions?"

Pointing to the $64 billion trade in 1982 between the two countries, and the $18 billion U.S. trade deficit, Dr. Smylie noted the differing patterns of exchange: from the United States, raw material, food, chemicals; from Japan, manufactured goods. Japan's recovery after World War II demanded courage, he said, in which recovery the United States has exercised unparalleled influence. For Japan, the key word was "management". He noted dissimilar social organization, such as the relation of labor and government, patterns of decision-making, differing perceptions about government protectionism and military security. Dr. Smylie spoke of vulnerability: Japan, although achieving great power, is dependent on outside resources; the United States although powerful with many resources, is also experiencing vulnerability. He concluded "strength must come from our spiritual resources."

Referring to the subject of work ethics, Professor Kikuo Yamaoka of Waseda University, remarked that while the United States was involved in the Vietnam War and its economic capacity was waning, Japan devoted itself to economic development. The United States has criticized Japan's joint efforts between government and industry for certain target industries which invade the U.S. market. A commission has been appointed to ameliorate some of these policies. Professor Yamaoka pointed out that military expansion is a waste of resources which are finite and he warned against the export of arms to lesser-developed countries. He spoke of disarmament as deeply in the oriental philosophy of non-violence; of the need for development and a global perspective in the establishment of a New International Economic Order; and the need to advance human rights, which Asians call "human dignity." There was mentioned a concept of "common security" and "common good."

In discussion and in answer to questions, several polarities were expressed by the Professor: in 1982, Japan applied for 165,000 patents while the United States applied for 10,000; many Americans thought that Japan was getting a "free ride" in military security, while at the same time there was panic in the United States over the thought of military technology being transferred to Japan. Many U.S. religionists, as well as others, are distressed with U.S. preoccupation with the Soviet Union and the pressure on Japan to re-arm. In Japan, 13 percent of imports are food, 67 percent oil and raw materials, while 97-98 percent of exports are industrialized goods. Thus Japan depends on technology, with little self-sufficiency in food and raw materials.

POLITICS AND MILITARY ISSUES

Former enemies, Japan and Germany have become friends and allies, stated Dr. Homer Jack. Although there is United States controversy about the low Japanese military budget, Japan is still 8th among the leading military spenders of the world, sending aid to South Korea, Pakistan and Turkey. The United States, though pressuring for Japanese self-defense, has not asked Japan to scrap the "peace constitution", for which there is a majority of Japanese home support, and which states in Article 9 that the people "forever renounce war as a sovereign right of a nation". Dr. Jack related some nuclear problems: safety, waste disposal, health hazards, and relationship to weapons.

Stressing the "common good" concept, Professor Yoshiaki Iisaka compared it to a lighthouse built on a coast after many accidents. Although the builder did not think of the ships of other countries, many benefited. The builders then thought that these other countries should pay. He remarked that the United States had a "lighthouse" for its global strategy. He further said that without the U.S. nuclear umbrella Japan will be placed in danger. In its U.N. voting patterns the Japanese demonstrate their belief that the defense of Japan is tantamount to the defense of the free world. Commenting on the accelerating arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union, Professor Iisaka believes that the nuclear deterrent theory is false. He spoke of the new peace movement emerging in many countries against nuclear arms and for nuclear freeze.

CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS ISSUES

Although the many cultural differences are not the cause of economic and military problems, Dr. Malcolm Sutherland, Minister of Harvard Unitarian Church and former Professor of Theology and Culture, as well as former Executive Director of WCRP/U.S., stated that acquaintance with these dissimilarities may facilitate understanding differing sources of religious insights. He proposed that selected teachings from various faiths could help define the role of WCRP: in Shintoism, mankind's kinship with the rest of creation, all of which is divine and must not be destroyed or wasted; in Judaism, living under the judgment of a God of history and of nature, we harvest what we sow and must distinguish between good and evil in defining next steps; in Buddhism, choices are neither absolutely good nor evil but may be more or less humane and just; in Christianity, the need for and availability of grace, forgiveness and unearned love even though we make imperfect decisions; in Islam, the emphasis on absolute devotion to the source of grace by whose mercy good will be rewarded and evil will be punished.

"Our task", said Dr. Sutherland, "is to make explicit our religious vision", to help our industrial and military leaders understand the implications of decisions they make on our behalf.

"No line divides man and nature", said Dr. Giichi Muto, President of Saitama Technical College. Japan's culture is based on Buddhism, Shintoism and Confusianism. Buddhism teaches patience. Dr. Muto reported that the Japanese are getting more religious, sometimes resulting in strong activist movements. He questioned: by dialog can we teach young people?

Discussion covered many points: the danger of triumphalism when a nation identifies with one religion and engages in religious wars; from Greek thought, the separation between spirit and matter; in Japanese philosophy materials have a spirit; for too many, the "religion" of making money and consumerism; ceremonies used only for life's passages; default of churches in social issues; people finding spiritual resources outside of the church. In wondering why there was no urgency or crisis in discussion of cultural and religious differences, delegates questioned whether or not our basic cultures are oriented to peace.

Evaluating the tide of Japan/United States differences appeared essential to gain increased understanding as well as initiating a long-term perspective. Repeated were various key issues: global perspective; democracy and its implications; interdependence of nations and inter-relatedness of issues of trade, security and cultures; "common good"; prevention of nuclear war and the role of religionists; the new spiritual peace movements; and making explicit the religious attitudes and vision.

DECLARATION

In Honolulu, in 1972, during the second WCRP Japan/United States Inter-Religious Consultation, a Declaration was written. Dr. Yasuyoshi Sakata, Secretary-General of WCRP/Japan and Patriarch of Miso Gikyo, commenting on the bi-lateral slant of the Honolulu Declaration, asserted the need to improve and implement in action the global disarmament campaign. He affirmed the Japanese responsibility to help Korean victims of bombing. Reverend Sakata pointed out several areas of need: to strengthen the U.N. role, to commend the Japanese Peace Constitution, to educate the young people for peace, and to reinforce the role of the family in religious life.

A resolution on nuclear war was called for by Dr. Homer Jack. Commenting on Dr. Jack's proposal of a service project, I suggested a water project, since WCRP IV will be held in Africa where water is so desperately needed.

Buddhism teaches that war starts in the mind, said President Nikkyo Niwano. The use of nuclear weapons was triggered by Pearl Harbor, he said, and therefore, in war nobody can say who is right or wrong. Honesty and repentence form the foundation for mutual trust and confidence.

Work on the Tokyo Declaration started in a meeting of the entire Japan/United States delegations attending the Inter-Religious Consultation, and continued in a small working group. The Declaration is attached to this report.

IN CONCLUSION

In the United States we enter joint discussion and hope we will reach consensus. This is in contrast to "Nemawashi," rootbinding, the way by which decisions are reached in Japan. "Nemawashi" is a process of going to each person to find consensus before negotiations. It may be a long process but then, when the actual meeting takes place, decisions are made quickly without disagreement.

The meeting in Japan utilized neither "Nemawashi" nor consensus, yet individuals who were representatives of five different religions were listened to and heard. Their separate contributions greatly enriched each other and the group. The road to understanding and peace is indeed filled with many stumbling blocks. The dialog in Tokyo was a notable effort to smooth the path and leave a roadway for further consultation.●

THE RETIREMENT OF ROBERT HALLOWELL

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to properly recognize the retirement of a most devoted Federal employee, Robert Hallowell, who has recently served as the officer in charge of the Pittsburgh Office of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Later this month, Mr. Hallowell will retire after nearly 30 years of service with the Federal Government. He served in the U.S. Navy for 2 years from 1946 to 1948 before beginning Federal Employment with the Department of Agriculture as a marketing analyst.

In April of 1962, Mr. Hallowell joined the Department of Justice as an officer in the Border Patrol along the Mexican border. He studied Spanish and immigration law at the Border Patrol Academy in Texas, continued his studies at the University of Maine and, today, he speaks fluent Spanish.

His career in the Border Patrol involved night patrol in the desert of Texas in pursuit of illegal immigrants. His expertise and temperament led to promotions and later assignments in New York City, Newark, N.J., Portland, Maine, and Philadelphia, Pa. He has served, with distinction, for more than 4 years as officer in charge in Pittsburgh.

Mr. Hallowell is known as a dedicated worker and an expert in immigration law. He is an eminently fair and decent man with a wry sense of humor. I know him to be deeply committed to the service of our country. His personal sensitivity and integrity represent the highest ideals for public servants.

Our Nation has historically benefited from civil servants of high caliber. The administration of immigration cases require a wide range of personal qualities. Bob Hallowell successful discharge of that responsibility is amble evidence of the personal qualities he brought to public service.

He will be missed. On behalf of the public I have the honor to represent, I want to express appreciation for his service our extend best wishes for his retirement.●

USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF TOLL ROADS

HON. AUSTIN J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Congressman KOLTER and I introduced H.R. 3736, which would permit Federal participation in the construction of new toll roads in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, no one any longer disputes that our Nation must begin a massive rebuilding of our infrastructure. No one will dispute that the cost is enormous. During this time of budget constraints at all levels of government it is essential that we make our financing rules more flexible to make efficient use of the capital we have available. By permitting the States to use Federal funds for the construction of new toll roads necessary construction will be undertaken, and thousands of unemployed Americans will be put back to work. The long-term effects of this rebuilding will provide much needed stimulus to economic recovery in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In the State of Pennsylvania, a major drawback to economic revitalization and expansion is access to modern highways; highways capable of handling expeditious transportation of my State's resources and finished goods. The construction of direct routes to our larger cities from their outlying areas will greatly reduce transportation costs and time, improve productivity, and speed the efforts to revitalize many of our most depressed areas.

The program which has been proposed by the Pennsylvania Toll Road Task Force will "provide 130,000 man-years of employment during construction; an average of 24,000 jobs for each of the 4 years of construction for the first phase of the program, an average of some 9,000 jobs per year during each of the 4 years of the second phase. After completion, the program will create almost 11,000 permanent positions." The corresponding reduction in social costs attributable to transferring persons from the unemployed to the employed status is estimated to be a total of $313 million "over the 4 years of phase 1 and $116 million over the 4 years of the second phase of the program."

Mr. Speaker, the task force continues that:

> If both phases of the program are implemented, approximately 33,000 short- and 11,000 long-term jobs would be created and industry and the taxpayer would save some $430 million in social costs during the construction period and $35 million annually in the years immediately thereafter by reducing compensation and welfare payments.

OVERALL EMPLOYMENT IMPACTS DUE TO TOLL ROAD CONSTRUCTION

[Dollar amounts in the thousands]

Corridor	Short-term (construction period)		Long-term (annual after completion)	
	Employment (jobs) [1]	Social cost savings [2] [3]	Employment (jobs)	Social cost savings [3] [4]
New routes:				
Beaver Valley Expressway	3,200	$42,000	900	$3,000
Mon Valley Expressway	9,200	120,000	2,600	8,000
U.S. 119 and T.R. 66	2,400	31,000	1,200	4,000
U.S. 219 (Ebensberg to I-80)	9,200	120,000	2,100	7,000
Total, phase A	24,000	313,000	6,800	22,000
U.S 219 (I-80 to New York State line)	2,300	30,000	1,400	4,000
U.S. 219 (Maryland State line to Pennsylvania turnpike)	2,700	35,000	1,600	5,000
U.S. 220	1,900	25,000	500	2,000
U.S. 40/119	2,000	26,000	500	2,000
Total, phase B	8,900	116,000	4,000	13,000
Total impacts—new routes	32,900	429,000	10,800	35,000
Improvements-reconstruction:				
Turnpike program	3,800	49,300		
I-80 and I-70 (west)	6,300	82,000		
Total impacts—improvements reconstruction	10,100	131,300		
Total	43,000	560,300	10,800	35,000

[1] For each of the 4 years during construction.
[2] Total for the 4-year construction period.
[3] 1983 dollars.
[4] Average annual savings over the initial four years after completion.

Mr. Speaker, by enabling the Federal Government to join with State and local governments to build these toll roads not only will we be putting thousands of our neighbors back to work, but we are insuring that the Federal Government will receive the most impact for its money. The Federal Government will receive 100 percent of its investment through a share of the toll receipts, and therefore will be able to participate in more rebuilding and maintenance.

The concept of charging tolls fits in with this administration's belief in the implementation of user fees to build and maintain public facilities. I believe that it is time for the Federal Government to change current practices and allow the States the flexibility to use Federal funds to achieve the maximum benefits for their citizens.●

THE 98TH CONGRESS NATURAL GAS LEGISLATION

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 29, the House Energy and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Fossil and Synthetic Fuels reported to the full committee comprehensive natural gas legislation. This action took place at the 11th markup session, sessions which began on May 25. The 11 markup sessions followed 10 days of subcommittee hearings which began on March 16 and concluded on April 21. The Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, at its 31st markup session, reported out its own version of natural gas legislation on July 26. A clean bill, S. 1715 (Rept. No. 205) was introduced in the Senate on July 29. At this point, no announcement has been made with respect to consideration by the full Senate or the full House Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of our colleagues, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a listing of the House natural gas bills and resolutions that have been introduced during the 98th Congress up until July 29.

The listing follows:

Bill number	Date introduced	Sponsor
1. H.R. 4	January 3	Michel.
2. H.R. 20	January 3	Kastenmeier.
3. H.R. 131	January 3	Gramm.
4. H.R. 232	January 3	Nowak.
5. H.R. 482	January 6	Byron.
6. H.R. 583	January 6	Glickman.
7. H.R. 619	January 6	Kastenmeier.
8. H.R. 705	January 6	Tauke.
9. H.R. 796	January 25	Gaydos.
10. H.R. 827	January 25	LaFalce.
11. H.R. 873	January 25	Oberstar.
12. H.R. 909	January 25	Volkmer.
13. H.R. 910	January 25	Volkmer.
14. H.R. 1359	February 8	Skelton.
15. H.R. 1422	February 10	Young (MO).
16. H.R. 1441	February 15	Corcoran.
17. H.R. 1685	February 25	Hertel.
18. H.R. 1686	February 25	Hertel.
19. H.R. 1752	March 2	Addabbo.
20. H.R. 1759	March 2	Coleman (MO).
21. H.R. 1760	March 2	Corcoran (by request).
22. H.R. 2012	March 9	Collins.
23. H.R. 2054	March 10	Bedell.
24. H.R. 2154	March 16	Gephardt.
25. H.R. 2164	March 16	Tauke.
26. H.R. 2182	March 17	Schroeder.
27. H.R. 2499	April 12	Ritter.
28. H.R. 2508	April 12	Slattery.
29. H.R. 2565	April 14	Corcoran.
30. H.J. Res. 58	January 6	Dixon.
31. H.J. Res. 192	March 11	Corcoran.
32. H. Con. Res. 29	January 25	Collins.
33. H. Con. Res. 88	March 16	Donnelly.
34. H. Con. Res. 96	March 24	Whittaker.
35. H. Res. 38	January 25	Gaydos.
36. H. Res. 55	February 2	St Germain.

●

ECONOMIC CONVERSION

HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I am filing a bill today called the Economic Conversion Act of 1983, which is directed at assisting communities about to suffer the economic losses entailed in a major defense contract cancellation or the closing of a military installation.

Virtually every Member of the House knows firsthand the dire economic consequences of a plant or a base closing to a community, and the importance of preparing for such an eventuality. The Economic Conversion Act of 1983 assists such preparation, adds an element of stability to a community's economic life, and eases whatever dependence it may have on defense contract work or the presence of military personnel.

In a word, the Economic Conversion Act of 1983 is an anchor. Its aim is to keep business and industry in a community after the loss of Pentagon business and to assure that the highly skilled worker corps, laid off by a contract cancellation, do not precipitously pack up their bags and move out of town.

The bill, specifically, has two provisions:

The Department of Defense is directed to establish a 5-year pilot program to aid workers who have been engaged in defense contract work, but who have been laid off as a result of a contract cancellation.

And the Department of Defense is directed to provide 1-year advance notification of a major contract cancellation, amounting to $10 million or more, or a base closing, for the purposes of allowing the affected community to plan an alternative course of action to stabilize its economy.

I believe that both provisions will find general acceptance in the House, as this body has considered the matter before, in a similar form, during the 96th Congress. At the time, the legislation was approved by a voice vote. The bill, unfortunately, went no further than the House, as Congress adjourned shortly thereafter.

What was understood then, as what should be understood now, is that our economy, on the national scale and on the local scale, depends on our communities; and that, conversely, our communities depend on thriving business and gainfully employed Americans.

Defense contract work has only made this dependency greater. When defense spending is at a high level, prosperity may cloud the underlying historical, if not scientific, fact that what goes up must come down—especially defense spending, which has experienced great fluctuations over the years. This leaves our communities in a very precarious position, indeed.

Consider for a moment the consequences of a plant closing to a community. According to an Economic Development and Law Center Report, impacted communities will see their tax base shrink. Property, utility, and income taxes paid by the company will be lost. And so will sales taxes, where they are collected.

The community also loses at the employee end as well. Consumption power is weakened; laid off workers do not purchase as much. And the tax base shrinks.

And down, as a result of all of these factors, goes the community's standard of living. Those who have not been forced to leave to look for a new jobs are driven away because public facilities have deteriorated and public serv-

ices have decreased—all because of a weakened tax base.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that that is what the 96th Congress House membership saw when it approved similar legislation then. And I believe that the picture that I have painted and the strong, purposeful intent of the Economic Conversion Act of 1983 will prompt this Congress to follow suit.

Economic conversion is stability. It is also prosperity. Through economic conversion our economy develops options. Skilled workers, laid off from defense contract work, can bring their much needed skills to private sector work. Closed military installations can become schools, hospitals, recreational facilities—upgrading a community's standard of living.

There is nothing wrong with planning options, eliminating our dependence on defense spending. Indeed, there is much right with it. It is good, hardnosed economics, with an eye to the future. Business does it. Now it is Government's turn.

Let us take the first step and accept the important role economic conversion has in our economy.●

TO AMEND THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1920

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. SYNDER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, otherwise known as the "Jones Act." The Jones Act has served as an important cornerstone for U.S. maritime policy by requiring that the transportation of merchandise or passengers by water between points in the United States, must be on U.S.-built, manned, and owned vessels. This doctrine has served to preserve and promote the ship operating and ship construction industries in the United States.

The bill which I am introducing today would phase in over a 15-year period the Jones Act requirements application to the Virgin Islands passenger trade only. My bill would not change the current Virgin Islands exemption in regard to all other nonpassenger trade.

The United States purchased the Virgin Islands from Denmark in 1916. Section 21 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, extended the coastwise laws to all island territories and possessions not already covered unless the President issued an annual proclamation exempting that island territory or possession from the coastwise laws because of inadequate shipping service.

For 12 years, the President issued an annual proclamation exempting the Virgin Islands from the coastwise laws. In 1936, Congress amended the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 to provide an open-ended exemption for the Virgin Islands which would remain in effect until removed by Presidential proclamation. It is my understanding that it was understood at that time, that the exemption was only supposed to last until adequate shipping service had been established.

Since 1936, we have seen the passenger trade to the Virgin Islands grow steadily. Unfortunately, the overwhelming number of vessels calling on those U.S. possessions are of foreign registry. However, today, the U.S.-flag passenger industry is staging a comeback. Just 1 year ago, the SS *Constitution* joined her sistership the SS *Independence* in the Hawaiian trade. In addition, some smaller passenger vessels are being constructed in U.S. shipyards. For example, as recently as July 16 of this year, Jeffboat, Inc., of Jeffersonville, Ind., launched a 100-passenger vessel, the *Newport Clipper.* In addition, several other maritime interests have expressed an interest in either initiating new passenger service or expanding existing capacity.

In order to accommodate this rapidly expanding commercial interest in investing in U.S.-flag shipping, I am introducing the bill today. I believe that the 15-year phase in of the Jones Act will provide the maritime industry with a sufficient opportunity to demonstrate that adequate U.S. shipping capacity does exist and that the underlying reasons for the Virgin Islands exemption, in regards to passengers, are no longer valid.●

CHARLES MESNICK

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, August 13, 1983, the Valley Cities Jewish Community Center will honor Charles Mesnick for more than 40 years of service to the community.

Charles Mesnick was born and raised in Cleveland. After graduating from Western Reserve University where he majored in journalism and was a Golden Gloves boxing champion, he became a sports writer for the Cleveland Plain Dealer. He completed his education at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles where he earned a master's degree in social work.

In his early career, he worked for the USO-JWB during 1941 and 1942. On February 1, 1943, the date that Jewish Centers Association was legally incorporated, he began his long and productive association with that organization. After serving in the U.S. Navy from 1944 to 1946 he returned to the JCA as Assistant Executive Director, a position he held until 1952. He was then appointed director of the Beverly-Fairfax Center and became director of the Westside Center when it opened officially on March 1, 1954. He served in this capacity until 1964 after which time he returned to the position of Assistant Executive Director of JCA. From 1967 until his retirement in 1975 Charles Mesnick was Executive Director of the Jewish Centers Association.

During his 33 years with JCA, Charles Mesnick was responsible for initiating and directing many innovative programs which met the needs of a rapidly growing population in Los Angeles. In addition to opening and directing the Westside Center which was the first large city center nationwide to be built after World War II and served as a model for others to follow, Charles Mesnick developed special programs for the young and old in the community. Country camps, the Sierra trips, and the Israel trip were inaugurated. The Extension Division was expanded into the Community Services Division, with its own board and officers, serving the outlying communities with two branch offices and full-time professional staff assigned to the regions. He also gave leadership to the founding and growth of the retired senior volunteer programs; the strengthening of the Jewish Centers Associates, and the gains of support through the travel program. He gave personal leadership to the friendship membership program which has brought financial support for a variety of activities through the years. Through his efforts, JCA has developed strong ties and cooperative programs with other agencies in the Jewish and general community.

Charles Mesnick is now well into his first decade as a professional volunteer bringing to his many activities the expertise and caring which were his trademarks during his 33 years of professional community work. His many memberships and activities include serving as president of the Western States Chapter of the Association of Jewish Center Workers and member of the national executive board; founder and president of the Jewish Communal Retirees Association of Los Angeles for the past 7 years; chairman of the social services division of the United Jewish Welfare Fund; executive secretary of the West Coast Chapter, U.S. Committee of Sports for Israel, and member of the national executive committee; member of the board of governors, Western States Region, National Jewish Welfare Board, and member of the national physical education and health committee. Charles Mesnick has been honored by many community organiza-

tions for his extraordinary efforts on behalf of the community.

In all of his efforts he has been assisted and encouraged by his wife of 46 years, the former Dora Gewirtz, his two sons and, more recently, has found special joy and happiness in his granddaughter, Wendy.

I ask the Members to join me in congratulating Charles Mesnick for 40 years of exemplary service. May he have many more years of a happy and productive life.●

LET US KEEP OUR VISTA VOLUNTEERS

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to share my support for the VISTA volunteers in my district. In Baltimore, we have a nonprofit agency, the Neighborhood Design Center, Inc. (NDC), which has been providing architectural and planning assistance to low-income community groups since 1968. In 1971, NDC was originally granted VISTA volunteers to assist with project requests from numerous community groups. Due to the help of these volunteers, NDC aided in the design and completion of over 200 community projects.

It should be noted that the VISTA volunteers' participation enabled professional planners and architects, as well as university students from the University of Maryland, Morgan State University, the Community College of Baltimore, and the Maryland Art Institute, to volunteer their time and skills, worth up to $25,000 annually.

In 1982, the NDC once again received VISTA support, making possible the continuation of its community involvement. During this time, NDC was also able to implement a low-cost/no-cost weatherization and training program. Currently, these programs are being continued with the 1983 VISTA volunteers.

The Neighborhood Design Center, Inc. operates on an austere budget and with only an executive director, one full-time project coordinator, and one part-time secretary. Accordingly, the use of the VISTA volunteers has been critical to their ability to provide much needed community assistance.

The VISTA volunteers go beyond the duties of coordinating volunteer services for community projects. Their work also includes training people in self-help.

On a final note, the VISTA program provides a truly valuable experience for its volunteers. In our community, these volunteers were recruited from area colleges and have degrees in subjects related to the work of the Neighborhood Design Center. VISTA service with NDC will educate these students further in community design and planning. It will also develop their leadership and training skills. Overall, they will learn how to best serve their country and community.

I would ask my colleagues to join with me in support of our VISTA volunteers throughout the Nation and let us fight any attempts to eliminate this valuable program.●

U.S. MANAGEMENT TRAINING AND POLICIES

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, in our analysis of our economic problems, we must not focus our efforts only on Government policies. For though it is true that new Government policies, many of which fall in the category of industrial policies, are necessary to revitalize our economy, it is just as true that the private sector must take some initiatives on its own.

One area in particular which the private sector must examine is that of management training. Given the short-run finance perspective of most American managers, it is not surprising that in the long run many of our industries are in trouble

I urge my colleagues to read the following article which appeared in the Washington Post that discusses U.S. management training and practices.

AND THE INCOMPETENT AMERICANS—U.S. MANAGERS ARE "TECHNICALLY ILLITERATE" AND OUT OF TOUCH

(By Yoshi Tsurumi)

Whenever I start teaching a new class of business school students, I give them a little math test to get some idea about their technical skills.

Typically, I ask them to find the value of "x" and "y" in a couple of quadratic equations or to draw a graph of the function of one of these equations on the "xy" plane.

These are not usually difficult problems as math goes. Over 90 percent of 10th grade Japanese students can do the first one, and about 85 percent can handle the second. One would expect future American business leaders could perform these calculations with ease, since quadratic equations have to do with the fundamentals of minimizing and maximizing values—which, after all, is what business is all about.

But my American students (at universities such as Harvard, Columbia and UCLA) do not handle these problems with ease. Only about one-third usually can find the values of "x" and "y," and very few can graph these values. Not only that, they complain bitterly about having to do these problems. They tell me they don't see the relevance of them to business.

This points up what I believe is one of the most serious problems facing American business; the technical illiteracy of its managers and executives. Few of them have the skills to solve real world problems. Business decisions require weighing variables (x and y) such as sales and costs, product quality and productivity, price and market share, profits and taxes. But business managers aren't well-equipped to reason and think in those terms.

I have compared the top three executives of 24 leading Japanese manufacturers with the top three executives of 20 leading American competitors in such fields as semiconductors, computers, consumer electronics, steel, autos, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, industrial equipment and processed foods.

The differences are dramatic. Two-thirds of the Japanese executives had science or engineering degrees, compared with only one-third of the American ones.

Furthermore, none of the Japanese executives without technical training rose through their legal or financial ranks. But over two-thirds of the American executives reached the top through careers as corporate lawyers, accountants, and financial officers. Also, the Japanese executives with non-technical backgrounds were heavily schooled in domestic and international sales operations, while the American executives with non-techincal backgrounds have mostly risen through advertising careers and corporate planning. This is typical of the career track of the new breed of American manager with an MBA degree.

The whole preparation of American executives tends to make them aloof from the factory floor and from the human beings who are involved in the day-to-day task of making products.

This process begins early. People who make it to the top of Japanese industry usually have spent several years sweeping their own classrooms and cleaning their school toilets. In elite U.S. schools, of course, there are "custodial personnel, to do that dirty work.

If many young Americans entering leading graduate schools are already technically illiterate, three or four semesters of business school are likely to increase their disdain for getting their hands dirty in classrooms and factories.

Once they join a company opportunities for experience at the ground level floor are limited. The result is that the people running U.S. companies lack familiarity with the organizations they are guiding. Is it any wonder that they are drawn to legal or financial solutions rather than technical or human ones?

The Japanese chief executives I surveyed spent, on average, 21 years in the same company before they were promoted to the lowest rank of corporate officer, and an additional 11 years in the same firm before they reached the rank of chief executive officer.

With a few exceptions, they joined their firm right after graduation. Their American counterparts typically had gone through three or four job changes and had spent an average of only nine years before becoming a corporate officer.

Subsequently, it took them only four to five years to become chief executive. In the United States 15 percent had been brought in from outside to become chief executive.

This isn't the pattern in all American firms. Among my corporate samples were IBM, Procter & Gamble, Du Pont and Texas Instruments. Their chief executives' career profiles are similar to those of their Japanese counterparts. These American firms appear to demand that chief executives be thoroughly familiar with their people, products, and markets. It is no acci-

dent, then, that these firms have conceded nothing to their Japanese competitors.

A typical Japanese business graduate who joins a company will spend 6 months to a year at a factory, followed by a series of assignments that help him get to know factory workers, engineers and managers. He is introduced to a corporate culture that encourages its employes to try out new things, learn from mistakes, and share information. He might even be sent out to work in a store where his company's products are sold, to see how the products are accepted by customers.

Compare that with the experience of many American MBAs who are told to show "results" within nine months to a year. They are not supposed to make mistakes. They hide precious information from other people. They are forbidden to make contacts with the people in other departments without going through proper channels.

These whiz kids rush to reorganize the work place, shave the cost of maintaining machinery or developing new products, concoct creative accounting schemes, and fire "low achievers." Chances are they won't be around when their splashy gestures prove to be disastrous. They will have moved on to assume more lucrative, higher-ranked jobs elsewhere.

Too many American MBAs are taught to treat ordinary employes as disposable "direct labor cost." They are taught to swallow uncritically the myth that corporations exist only to reward abstract stockholders, that capital budgeting and financial controls are the most effective management tools.

One result of the U.S. system is executives such as David Roderick, chairman of U.S. Steel. Roderick, an accountant by training, spent much of the $1 billion that the U.S. Congress made available through various tax cuts to purchase Marathon Oil—instead of modernizing steel facilities and keeping steel workers employed.

The irony of all this is that the Japanese system is modeled after an American system that no longer exists. After the war, Japanese industry put a premium on practical knowledge and hands-on experience. We looked to American teachers who taught that "high purpose, courage, honor and independence" were leadership qualities crucial to a company's success.

You won't hear such things discussed in the best business schools today. Instead, we have a business culture that applauds executives who help themselves to big bonuses and raid other companies while sending loyal workers to the unemployment lines.●

IN HONOR OF RICHARD W. LAMB, JR.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scouts of America has played a vital role in building character and leadership qualities in young men for many, many years and has taught them many useful skills that serve them the rest of their lives. For these reasons, the need for very talented and capable leaders of the Boy Scouts, people that our young men can look up to and respect, is of tantamount importance. Richard W. Lamb, Jr., Scout executive of the Long Beach Area Council, is one such leader. Dick has served admirably in this post for the past 10 years. On August 24, Dick will bring to a close 33 years of service to the Boy Scouts of America when he will be stepping down. A retirement dinner in honor of his many years of service will be held on that day at the International City Club in Long Beach, Calif.

Dick's involvement with the Boy Scouts began as a youth in Longview, Wash., where he earned the highest Scout award, the Eagle Rank, in 1942. After receiving his bachelor of science degree from the University of Oregon in 1950, and serving as rifle platoon leader in the Korean campaign from 1951 to 1952, Dick returned to begin his professional career in Scouting, serving as field Scout executive with the Portland, Oreg., Council. He then served as district executive in Sacramento, Calif., and in Medford, Oreg. He became council executive in 1958, and served the same position in Klamath Falls, Oreg., and Anaheim, Calif. In 1968, he joined the national council as an area director and served in that capacity until he joined the Long Beach Area Council in 1973.

Outside of his Scouting career, Dick has also found time to serve as director of the International City Club of Long Beach and as director and vice president of the Los Angeles United Way Credit Union. He is also a member of Rotary International in Long Beach.

Dick and his wife Bonnie Susan have four children: Richard W. III, Nancy Susan, Elizabeth Hope, and Scott Walter.

Dick will be greatly missed by the entire Scouting community. My wife Lee joins me in wishing Dick, Nancy, and their four children all the best in their future endeavors.●

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS ABOUT THE SENATE WPPSS LEGISLATION

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, the Northwest is anxious to find a comprehensive solution to the vexing problems of the Washington Public Power Supply System.

The key to such a solution will be regional consensus among the ratepayers, public and private utilities, vital job-providing industries, and other affected interests.

Information gathered during a Senate Energy hearing scheduled today will be helpful toward that end. Over the August work period, all affected interests will have more time to analyze the potential impacts of an amendment currently under consideration by the Senate. I am also pleased that House hearings have been scheduled for mid-September to further evaluate the WPPSS problems.

It is with the intention of solving these problems that some in the Senate have proceeded with an amendment to the Interior Appropriations bill that would offer alternative financing for at least one WPPSS plant.

However, the speed with which this amendment was drawn up and the lack of involvement by all affected parties have raised perhaps more questions than have been answered.

For these reasons, the Northwest Public Power Council and Washington Public Utility Districts' Association have voted to oppose this particular amendment.

One of the critical questions concerning this amendment has not been fully addressed: how soon could the power from WPPSS 3 be used in the Northwest and can that power be marketed outside the Northwest without erosion of the preference clause?

Currently, Southwest purchases of Northwest power occur largely at a "spill" rate, which is cheap because the surplus power would otherwise be spilled over the dams. Will utilities from outside the region purchase the power from WPPSS 3 at the cost of its production? If not, will the federally generated, preference power have to be melded with the cost of more expensive nuclear power in order to make those sales? If so, what is the cost to the Northwest ratepayers?

BPA has not proposed to scrap WPPSS 3, but to delay its construction. Would the alternative financing proposed in the Senate amendment cost Northwest ratepayers less dollars than delayed construction?

The answers to these questions will certainly come as the Congress evaluates this issue in detail.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues an editorial by the Vancouver, Wash., Columbian. This editorial raises a number of questions that remain to be answered.

After a thorough analysis, a solution to the WPPSS problems, regardless of whether it entails Federal legislation, must be of benefit to all the Northwest.

The editorial follows:

[From the Vancouver Columbian, July 27, 1983]

HASTE, SECRECY RAISE SUSPICION—LATEST WPPSS BAILOUT PLAN FALTERS

Legislation now pending in Congress could conceivably salvage one of the five power plants begun and then abandoned by the Washington Public Power Supply System. But Congress should not adopt laws that

"could" work, especially not in complicated circumstances like those surrounding WPPSS.

The rough idea for the legislation originated just a few weeks ago among four Northwest private utilities with money tied up in the plant, WPPSS Nuclear Project 3. Essentially, the plan calls for the Bonneville Power Administration to borrow the capital needed to complete the project, with the loans to be repaid through BPA rates.

During the weekend of July 15-17, closed-door meetings between U.S. Senate staff and utility representatives were held to draft the legislation. It was tacked onto an appropriations bill July 18, and by the next day it had been approved by a subcommittee and committee and sent to the Senate floor, where it now awaits action.

At no point in that process were the public utility districts in Oregon and Washington consulted, even though they own 70 percent of the plant and would pay the bill for its completion through their rates.

At no point were many of the Northwest's congressmen consulted, even though their support is critical if the measure's backers hope to see it pass the House.

No attempt was made to answer critical questions about the impact of the legislation on BPA rates, the mechanism BPA would use to arrange the loans, what kind of financing would be obtained or whether the region could even use the power that Plant 3 would produce.

The private utilities seem to have only one goal in sight—completion of the plant, no matter what the implications. From their narrow viewpoint, questions like those concerning the impact on BPA rates don't matter much—they have millions of dollars invested in the plant, money they would lose if it is never completed.

Others, however, are taking a more comprehensive view. Largely because of unanswered questions and the manner in which the legislation was drafted, the Clark County PUD registered its opposition to the plan last week. The Public Power Council, an organization of public utilities, followed suit Tuesday. Support among the Northwest delegation in the Senate is faltering, while opposition in the House is growing. It now seems the plan may die as quickly as it was born.

That it as it should be. Haste and secrecy helped create the WPPSS fiasco; they cannot be part of its solution.●

TRIBUTE TO SHERRILL W. HUDSON, COMMUNITY LEADER

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues an outstanding and close personal friend who left the Dayton area last month. Sherrill W. Hudson, former partner-in-charge of the Dayton office of Deloitte Haskins & Sells has accepted a promotion as partner-in-charge of the south Florida practice of the firm.

Few leaders in Dayton have achieved so much distinction in so short a time. His activities are a virtual directory of civic involvement in the Dayton area, and include business, cultural, and charitable organizations. He is a rare combination of energy, ability, and compassion. He is always willing to help an individual or a cause.

On August 11, friends will gather at a farewell reception in his honor. The reception is sponsored by Jesse Philips, chairman of Philips Industries, Inc., and Perry B. Wydman, president of Interstate Financial Corp. It will be a small token of thanks to one who has given so much.●

DENNIS BRUTUS

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I remember attending grade school and, in the mornings, rising with my classmates to pledge allegiance to our flag. I especially remember repeating the last phrase of that pledge to myself after the class had finished—"with liberty and justice for all." Those words really meant something to me, and I was proud to live in a country that offered both those fundamental rights to everyone.

Well, Mr. Speaker, our colleague Mr. FRANK has drawn our attention to an instance in which a man in our country might be denied both the liberty and the justice to which he is entitled. Mr. FRANK has introduced H.R. 3705 for the relief of Mr. Dennis Brutus, a South African poet and outspoken critic of apartheid who is in the midst of a battle over efforts to deport him to southern Africa.

Mr. Brutus' fears about returning to southern Africa are not unfounded. Although born in Zimbabwe, he grew up in South Africa. In the early 1960's, he was arrested for his antiapartheid activities and was released only on the condition that he would be imprisoned if he ever returned to South Africa. Mr. Brutus faces potential dangers in other countries as well. Just last year, a former nationalist leader in South Africa with whom Brutus was imprisoned was fatally shot in Zimbabwe, allegedly by the South African secret police.

Mr. Brutus has lived in the United States for the past 10 years. He has been a professor of African and English literature at Northwestern University for many of those years. Why, then, is he facing potential deportation? Mr. Chairman, Dennis Brutus could be deported because of a technical violation of the immigration statutes. He originally held a British passport, and it was with this document that he obtained his visa, which granted him permission to work here. But when Zimbabwe became an independent nation in 1980, Mr. Brutus' passport was revoked. Zimbabwe issued a new one, but he was late in applying for the extension of his visa here. Then his file was misplaced for 6 months. Thus, when he continued to work at Northwestern University, he violated a law that forbids employment of an alien with an expired visa.

Despite the unusual circumstances, the State Department is zealously pursuing action against Mr. Brutus. He has been told by these authorities that he could return to Great Britain, where he lived and worked after he left Africa in 1966. The British authorities, however, present a different picture: They advised him that his immigration rights have lapsed in Britain because he failed to live there for 2 years.

Furthermore, the State Department has indicated that he is excludable from the United States under the McCarran-Walters Act, but has refused to tell Mr. Brutus why he has been judged excludable. He needs that information to defend his position. The Department is using classified documents and, as commonsense tells us, it is quite difficult to refute information that is not known. Surely this is a violation of those very rights to which I pledged allegiance so many years ago.

As chairman of the Congressional Arts Caucus, I have yet another interest in allowing Mr. Brutus to remain in our country. He offers an irreplacable cultural asset to our Nation. He has distinguished himself in his position as professor of African literature at Northwestern University. Few scholars have contributed so much to a better understanding of African culture and the dynamics of the apartheid system as Mr. Brutus. And, on top of his academic career, Mr. Brutus is an award winning poet. He has published seven collections of poetry, including "Sirens, Knuckles and Boots" (1962) and "Letters to Martha and Other Poems from a South African Prison" (1969). Instead of harassing and deporting this talented man, we should support his efforts and leave his mind free to produce his artwork in an unrestricted society.

I know that I am not alone in this position of defending Mr. Brutus for his artistic and academic ability. The Authors League of America, Inc., has recently submitted a letter of support to the Honorable Irving Schwartz, the judge who is presiding over Mr. Brutus' trial.

The letter reads:

THE AUTHORS LEAGUE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y., July 8, 1983.

Re. Dennis Brutus.

Hon. IRVING SCHWARTZ,
Immigration and Naturalization Service,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR JUDGE SCHWARTZ: The Authors League of America and The Authors Guild

are the national societies of professional authors, representing a total membership of 11,000.

On behalf of our members, we respectfully urge that your Honor rule that Dennis Brutus should be granted political asylum in the United States. We believe that he has earned the right to permanently reside and teach here. He has made substantial contributions to American education during his many years of teaching in our universities. And through his teaching and his poetry, he has become a compelling inspiration to innumerable college students, including members of the black and other minorities.

Dennis Brutus should not be wrenched from the American academic community, in which he has earned a respected place and warm welcome, and deported—to Zimbabwe or any other country. To destroy his career and life here would be cruel and pointless. Deportation also would expose him to personal risk because of his strong opposition to the government and policies of the Republic of South Africa.

We applaud the granting of political asylum to ballet dancers, tennis stars and others seeking refuge in our country. But it would be strange if risk to personal safety, a minimal concern in many of these cases, is evaluated so stringently for Dennis Brutus that asylum would be denied this black teacher and poet who earned the enmity of a government whose policies are opposed by millions of Americans.

American authors join American teachers and scholars, distinguished representatives of the black community, members of Congress and others in urging that political asylum be granted to Dennis Brutus. It would be shocking if our government, which justly condemns the deportation and oppression of teachers and poets by authoritarian regimes, were to expel this eminent teacher and literary artist.

Sincerely yours,

HARRISON E. SALISBURY,
President,
The Authors League of America.
ANNE EDWARDS,
President,
The Authors Guild.

Mr. Speaker, if the Immigration and Naturalization Service were to deport Mr. Brutus because of the violation of a technicality, the United States would be expelling a world-renowned leader in the field of human rights, a master poet, an outstanding scholar, and an exceptional teacher. We have no choice but to grant him political asylum.●

APPRECIATION TO POWELL A. MOORE FOR HIS SERVICE

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, the departure of Powell A. Moore from his position as Deputy Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs will be a loss for the White House staff and for those of us who have worked with him over the years. I have learned to appreciate his judgment and his ability to get the job done.

I did not want to let this opportunity pass without taking note of his accomplishments and to wish him the best in his new endeavors.

In charge of White House relations with the U.S. Senate, Powell Moore was appointed to this position on January 19, 1981, by President-elect Ronald Reagan and was sworn in on January 21, 1981.

Prior to joining the White House staff, Mr. Moore had been engaged for the previous 6 years in governmental relations and Washington representation as a consultant for a variety of corporations and associations.

He began his Washington career in 1966 as an aide to the late Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia. When Senator Russell died in 1971, he became Deputy Director of Public Information for the U.S. Department of Justice and later served in the Office of Legislative Affairs at the White House under Presidents Nixon and Ford. When he left the White House staff to enter private business in 1975, he was a Deputy Special Assistant to the President.

Mr. Moore worked on the national Presidential campaign staff of President Nixon in 1972, of President Ford in 1976, and of President Reagan in 1980. His association with the Reagan campaign began in early 1979, and he was Assistant Director of Congressional Relations for the Reagan transition between election day in 1980 and the inauguration on January 20, 1981.

Mr. Moore graduated from the Henry Grady School of Journalism at the University of Georgia in Athens, Ga., in 1959. He is a former weekly newspaper editor in Georgia and served for 3½ years as a U.S. Army officer, including a tour in West Germany. Born on January 5, 1938, in Milledgeville, Ga., Mr. Moore is married to the former Miss Katherine Southward of Midway City, Calif. They live with two children in Alexandria, Va.●

AUTHORIZATION OF U.S. COMBAT FORCES

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today that would require congressional authorization before the introduction of U.S. combat forces into Central America. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by my distinguished colleagues FRANK HORTON, PAT SCHROEDER, TONY COELHO, STEWART MCKINNEY, JOE MOAKLEY, MORRIS UDALL, FERNAND ST GERMAIN, TOM HARKIN, BERKLEY BEDELL.

An identical resolution will be introduced today in the Senate by Senators HART and KENNEDY.

We are introducing this bill because we are seriously concerned about the direction that the Central America policy of this country has taken, and equally concerned that the Congress has not been playing its proper role in the formulation of this policy. I think it is clear that there has been insufficient consultation with the Congress in this regard, and that the present degree of congressional oversight is inadequate.

A couple of weeks ago, I read in the newspapers that two American naval battle groups were steaming for the coasts of Nicaragua. Then I read that as many as 3,000 to 4,000 ground troops—including combat troops—were to be deployed in Central America in a 6-month exercise called a maneuver. Today I read that that number may be more like 5,000 troops.

These reports have an ominous ring to them. But even more ominous is the fact that, while we are on the brink of military involvement in Central America, the Congress learns of major decisions only after they have been made.

Equally disturbing is the impression one gets, that the Departments of Defense and State are not far ahead of us in learning about the latest plans of the foreign policy experts in the White House.

Central America is a very volatile region, and United States involvement there has been steadily increasing. This situation demands a careful, restrained, and bipartisan policy, and close consultation with the Congress. Unfortunately, this has not been the case.

I find it unconscionable that the Congress could fail to address an issue of such overwhelming importance.

The Constitution places the responsibility for declaring war, and for regulating the Armed Forces, squarely on the Congress. And I think the Congress would be dangerously derelict in its duties if it allowed one man, even the President of the United States, to commit this country to a misconceived military adventure which could quickly escalate to a major role in a bloody and unwinnable war.

That is why I introduced an amendment to the Defense Authorization Act last week, and that is why I am introducing this bill today.

The bill says that the Congress will not abandon its responsibilities.

It says that, this time, we will not duck the issue while an ill-considered military involvement is steadily escalated, and we will not let the White House singlehandedly lead this Nation into a war.

The American people have made their feeling clear. The overwhelming consensus in the public is that the greatest danger this country faces in Central America is that of embroilment in another Vietnam style quag-

mire. On this issue, as on the issues of the Vietnam war, arms control and the nuclear arms race, the American people are ahead of their Government, and it behooves all of us in Washington to pay them heed.

Indeed, our top military leaders have also made their concerns about the direction of Central America policy known, and I am in complete agreement with them. The last thing that our military wants is to be ordered into a military conflict in Central America without strong and unified backing from the country.

If we as a country have learned anything from the mistakes of the Vietnam war—indeed, if we are to prevent a loss in Central America similar to the loss in Southeast Asia—we must realize that all the bombers, all the gunboats, all the radar facilities and all the sophisticated weaponry that we can bring to bear in these small, desperately poor Third World nations, can accomplish nothing but destruction if we ignore the social, economic, and political ills that are the causes of the conflict.

And we must remember that the effects of a mistaken military involvement are painfully felt at home as well as overseas. We must know that as we wreak destruction abroad, we tear at the very heart and soul of this great Nation of ours.

The bill I am introducing today is a call for a new direction in policy toward Central America. Let us approach the problem in the region with caution, let us approach it with compassion, let us approach it with reason, but above all let us approach it with unity.●

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE UNEMPLOYED

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr. Speaker, today I voted in favor of a proposal to address the health care needs to the unemployed because I believe that there currently exists a problem that this Congress should address.

However, I want to make it clear that I intend to work to see that any conference committee that will act on this matter would attach a means test to target the temporary help to those who desperately need it. Also, I will ask a conference committee to eliminate the requirements that this bill would impose on small businesses.

In summary, I recognize the need for health care for the unemployed and cast my vote to signal my support for that need. However, there are some serious shortcomings in the current bill that must be corrected before I would support a conference committee report.●

HONORS FOR JOHN PHILIP SOUSA

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, John Philip Sousa, one of the most prominent Portuguese Americans our country has known, was honored yesterday afternoon by a concert of his music on the steps of the Library of Congress. This special program was performed by the U.S. Marine Band, which Sousa led for more than 10 years, before a crowd which included the composer's grandson, John Philip Sousa III. Sousa, whose marches and other music have become a permanent part of American popular culture, is very deserving of this honor, both as a musician and composer who has made significant contributions to the arts, and as a representative of the many Americans of Portuguese ancestry who have made and are still making their own contributions to American society.

Sousa was born in Washington, D.C. on November 6, 1854, and by the age of 16 was already an orchestra leader in a number of American theaters. He joined the U.S. Marine Band in 1877 and was its conductor from 1880 until 1892, when he resigned to form his own band. He enjoyed a great deal of success during the following years, touring not only in this country, but also in Europe and, on one occasion, taking his band on a world tour.

Sousa was best known for his marches, which include such classics as "The Stars and Stripes Forever," the "Washington Post," and "Liberty Bell." In total, he composed nearly 100 marches, as well as writing a number of other songs, light operas, and orchestral suites. The many honors he received in his lifetime include the Victorian Order and the Grand Diploma of the Academy of Hainault. In addition, in 1940, a commemorative stamp was issued in his honor.

In spite of these many prestigious honors, Sousa's achievements are most appropriately recognized every time one of his popular marches is played. All Americans, whether of Portuguese descent or not, can be proud of the career and achievements of the man who is known as the March King.●

FAIR HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1983

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I introduced, with 13 of my colleagues, the Fair Housing Amendments of 1983.

This legislation is the culmination of months of work by the Reagan administration and various Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate to craft a proposal that puts teeth in title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968.

Under current law, the principal means of enforcement has been conciliation. However, it has become evident that the current law has shortcomings where parties enter into conciliation in bad faith. As former Secretary of HUD, Carla Hills, stated: "The most serious obstacle to an effective title VIII program is the lack of adequate enforcement provisions. . . ." President Reagan recently acknowledged this when he stated: "The gap in enforcement is the lack of a forceful backup mechanism which provides an incentive to bring the parties to the conciliation table with serious intent to resolve the dispute then and there. When conciliation fails, the Secretary [of HUD] has no place to go. In those few cases where good will is absent, the exclusive reliance on voluntary resolution is in the words of former Secretary Carla Hills, an 'invitation to intransigence.'"

Under the bill, the principal means of enforcement will continue to be conciliation. However, H.R. 3747 will provide a forceful backup mechanism to those who do not intend to enter the conciliation process in good faith.

Under H.R. 3747, an aggrieved person has 180 days following a discriminatory housing practice to file a complaint. If the complaint originated in a State or locality that has a certified HUD fair housing agency, then the complaint is referred there. Otherwise, the Secretary of HUD is to make and give notice of his or her decision whether to resolve the complaint as promptly as possible and, so far as practicable, this notice is to be given no later than 120 days after receiving the complaint or recalling it from a State or local agency.

If the complaint is not resolved within 30 days after notification to the respondent of the Secretary's determination to resolve it, or if the Secretary certifies that conciliation has been tried and will not work, the complaint may be referred to the Attorney General with a recommendation that a civil action be filed on behalf of the United States. If a civil action be filed

on behalf of the United States. If a civil action is filed by the Attorney General, the court may award injunctive relief and assess civil penalties of up to $50,000 for the first offense, and up to $100,000 for subsequent offenses. Additionally, the Secretary of HUD may recommend to the Attorney General that appropriate temporary or preliminary relief be sought pending final disposition of the complaint.

The above provisions of the bill constitute the "teeth" which is lacking under current law. Presently, the Attorney General has only "pattern or practice" jurisdiction. Additionally, the conciliation procedure is strengthened by allowing the parties to consent to binding arbitration. There is also authorization in H.R. 3747 for the Attorney General to seek specific performance of a conciliation agreement. Thus there are incentives to resolve the issue through the conciliation process which is the speediest, most effective way. The consequences of failure to conciliate may be a lawsuit filed against the person by the Attorney General. If the parties to a conciliation agreement fail to abide by its terms similar action by the Attorney General may result.

The action by the Attorney General does not preclude an aggrieved person from filing a complaint on his or her own behalf. Additionally, the statute of limitations for a private action has been extended from 180 days to 2 years. Also, individuals will no longer have to prove financial need to have their attorney's fees paid. In conformance with other civil rights attorney's fees provisions, the court may award attorney's fees to the prevailing party. The current ceiling on punitive damages in a private action is also removed. Finally, the Attorney General will be authorized to intervene in suits brought by individuals in which aggrieved persons can receive compensatory and punitive damages. Thus, the burden of litigation is borne by the Government.

H.R. 3747 preserves the existing pattern or practice jurisdiction of the Attorney General. It also authorizes the court to assess civil penalties of up to $50,000 and $100,000 for subsequent violations.

H.R. 3747 provides for mandatory referral of fair housing complaints to State or local fair housing agencies that administer "substantially equivalent" laws. It confirms as to remedies that a State or local law will be recognized if it provides an agency with the authority to investigate and conciliate complaints. These provisions recognize the desirability of resolving fair housing complaints at the most decentralized level where housing transactions occur. It recognizes the need to have the complaints resolved in the venue most convenient to all parties involved in the dispute.

Finally, one of the key provisions which is perhaps the most far-reaching and important is the one that adds handicapped persons as a new protected class. H.R. 3747 would make it illegal to refuse to sell, rent, or negotiate for the sale or rental of dwellings because of a handicap of the buyer or renter. Discriminatory activity would include refusing to permit reasonable modifications of the premises for occupancy, but in the case of rental dwellings, the renter must first agree to restore the premises, reasonable wear and tear excluded.

Discriminatory activity does not include the refusal to make changes in a dwelling at the expense of the owner or the refusal to modify current policies or rules if it would result in expense to the owner or unreasonably inconveniences the other persons.

Finally, while the definition of handicapped persons is written very broadly, it does not include any current impairment that consists of alcoholism or drug abuse, or any other impairment that would be a direct threat to the property or safety of others.

I hope the introduction of H.R. 3747 will spark the serious thoughtful and bipartisan debate on this major civil rights issue which needs to be addressed. It is a debate that needs to be devoid of political rhetoric if the strengthening of our fair housing laws is to become a reality. As the ranking minority member of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, I will be working very hard to accomplish the objective of putting teeth in the current act and to include handicapped persons as a covered class.●

NATIONAL CENTER FOR TOXICOLOGICAL RESEARCH

HON. BERYL ANTHONY, JR.

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, the President's private sector survey on cost control recently released the results of the Health and Human Services/Health Care Financing Administration and Public Health Service Task Force. The importance of this study and the recommendations that accompany it are that they represent the potential for more effective and efficient utilization of limited Federal resources.

Several of the task force's recommendations are of particular interest to me because they concern the National Center for Toxicological Research (NCTR), a sophisticated research facility located near Pine Bluff, Ark., in the Fourth Congressional District which I represent. The results of the study are important to every Member of Congress, however, because of our society's increasing reliance on chemicals, and the need we have as decisionmakers for accurate information to protect the public from health threats due to substances released in our environment.

NCTR is responsible for carrying out four basic tasks: To determine, through animal tests, the adverse effects of low dose, long-term exposure to chemical toxic agents or poison; to develop better tests to evaluate the limits of safe use of toxic chemicals in animal systems; to determine how these toxic agents affect animals; and to develop data to help apply test results from animals to man.

The information that NCTR gathers is passed on to regulatory agencies that must decide whether to permit a certain chemical or drug or substance to be sold or used.

I recently worked with members of the House Appropriations Committee to insure that NCTR received funding for much needed renovation of their facilities. I commend the members of this committee for recognizing the needs of the Center, and for including an amount of $2.5 million for a diet preparation facility and an inhalation-toxicology laboratory at the Center in the fiscal year 1984 appropriations bill.

I am equally pleased that the team of private industry executives studying the efficiency of the Federal Government has highly praised the work and management of NCTR. In addition to recommending that the Center's facilities and programs be expanded, the Presidential Commission also noted that, "the management systems put in operation by the NCTR Director were found to be the most effective of all agencies studied and appear to be applicable to wider use within the Federal structure."

The team assigned to study toxicological programs within the Federal Government observed that, "there is a history of problems with studies performed by contract firms." They suggested that NCTR should be "expanded to become more of a National Center," and do more of the Government's research work in the area of toxicology.

I am very encouraged by the support we have received in Congress for NCTR and the high praise the private sector initiative has given to the Center. I believe it shows that Congress and the private sector recognize the need to support the search for cures for cancer and birth defects, and protect the public from health threats in our environment. The report from the private sector survey on cost control demonstrates that Federal support of NCTR is a wise investment of limited Federal resources.●

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND SOVIET TYRANNY

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 2, 1983, Laurie Heyman of Deerfield, Ill., celebrated her bat mitzvah. The bat mitzvah marks the entry of a young Jewish girl into womanhood, a symbolic moment of passage from protected innocence to adult responsibility. It is an occasion at once joyous and solemn.

I call the attention of my colleagues to her bat mitzvah because Laurie's right of passage was more than symbolic. By corresponding with a Russian girl her own age, Irena Briskman, whose family has been refused the right to emigrate, to celebrate publicly Irena's bat mitzvah, or even to observe quietly the Sabbath privately in their own home, Laurie Heyman learned a hard lesson in geopolitics upon which we all ought to reflect.

The sharing of the bat mitzvah celebration with a Soviet refusenik, "Twinning" as it has been popularly labeled, is a moving and meaningful event for the families of both the American and Soviet youths. During the service an empty chair sits on the pulpit designated for the absent Soviet participant.

The "Twinning" service dramatically contrasts the religious freedoms in the United States with the oppression in the Soviet Union. Ironically, while the Heyman family celebrated Laurie's bat mitzvah in the States, the Briskman family was being arrested by the KGB for celebrating the Sabbath in the Soviet Union.

Laurie's bat mitzvah comes at a time when the Soviet Government has embarked on an emboldened campaign of anti-Semitism. How tragic it is that Irena, representative of all Soviet Jews, has been denied the most essential of all freedoms—the freedom to hold fast to an individual religious and cultural identity.

We in the United States must continuously pressure the Soviet Government to allow for the right of emigration and religious freedoms for its people. The courage and long-endured suffering of Soviet Jews is exemplified so well in the words of another heroic Jew, Albert Einstein: "As long as I have any choice in the matter, I shall live only in a country where civil liberty, tolerance, and equality of all citizens before the law prevail."

I praise Laurie for sharing her very personal celebration with another young woman, Irena Briskman, who, to this day, remains trapped in the Soviet Union. Let us all pray that Irena, too, will soon be able to celebrate her very own bat mitzvah in freedom.●

CONGRESSIONAL CONSENT FOR THE SOUTHEAST INTERSTATE LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT COMPACT

HON. BUTLER DERRICK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation, along with 19 of my colleagues in the Southeast, which seeks the consent of Congress for the Southeast Interstate Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management Compact.

In 1980, the Congress approved legislation which established Federal policy on the management and disposal of low-level radioactive wastes. Under the provisions of the Low-Level Waste Policy Act of 1980, each State is responsible for the disposal of low-level radioactive waste generated within their borders. Most important, however, this statute also stipulates that low-level radioactive waste can be most safely and efficiently managed on a regional basis. States are therefore urged to form regional compacts with their neighboring States, and subsequently present such compacts to the Congress for consent and approval. After January 1, 1986, and assuming the passage of congressional consent legislation, each region may ban the importation of low-level radioactive waste into their region.

At the present time, legislation is already pending before the House of Representatives seeking congressional consent for both the Northwest and Central Interstate Low-Level Waste Compacts. The Southeast region is the third region to formally transmit consent legislation to the Congress for the compact they have agreed to. I would note that my distinguished colleague and senior Senator from South Carolina, Hon. STROM THURMOND, will be introducing this legislation in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the Southeast Interstate Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management Compact represents the culmination of a lengthy and complex process to seek agreement between the various States of the Southeast region for safe management and disposal of low-level radioactive materials within the region. To date, seven of the eight eligible States in the Southeast region, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia, have fully ratified this compact. Georgia ratified an earlier version of the compact in 1982, and is expected to ratify amendments to that compact next year.

Under the terms of the Southeast Interstate Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management Compact, the Chem-Nuclear Services, Inc., burial site in Barnwell County, will serve as the first regional disposal site for the Southeast region. The compact makes the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia initially eligible parties to the Southeast Compact. The compact also makes provisions for the addition of party States to the region, as well as the withdrawal by any party State from the compact.

Article 4 of the Southeast Compact creates the Southeast Interstate Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management Commission which consists of two voting members from each party State. The commission is to appoint its own chairman, meet at least once a year, and is responsible for approving the applications of eligible as well as nonparty States to bcome a party State to the compact, submit annual reports to the Governors and Legislatures of party States, and develop procedures for determining the type and number of regional facilities which are necessary to manage the low-level radioactive waste generated within the region. The commission also has the authority to authorize, by a two-thirds vote, the importation of wastes into the region beyond the January 1, 1986 exclusionary date set out in the Low-Level Waste Policy Act of 1980. The commission activities will be funded by both a one-time payment from party States and levies imposed on wastes disposed at the regional facility.

Mr. Speaker, the first regional site for the Southeast region will be the Chem-Nuclear Services, Inc., burial site, located in my congressional district. This site will be available under the terms of the compact through 1992. After that time, another State within the region will have to come forward to provide a next regional site.

As many of my colleagues are aware, I have been greatly concerned with issues relating to nuclear waste disposal througout my tenure in this body. My home State of South Carolina presently stores one-third of the Nation's high-level nuclear defense wastes in temporary storage at the Savannah River Plant, it operates one of only two commercial burial sites for low-level nuclear wastes at the Chem-Nuclear Services, Inc., site in Barnwell County, and was under active consideration throughout the formulation of high-level nuclear waste disposal legislation as a site for temporary, or "away-from-reactor" storage of spent nuclear fuel from commercial nuclear power reactors.

The citizens of South Carolina understand well the benefits derived from the research and medical uses of

radioactive materials, as well as the commercial and defense applications of nuclear energy. The regional disposal concept established in the Low-Level Waste Policy Act of 1980, and which is the foundation of the congressional consent legislation I am today introducing, represents the most equitible solution to a problem nobody wants, and which to date has been borne disproportionately by my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly solicit the cosponsorship of this legislation by my colleagues in the House, and urge the committees of jurisdiction to move promptly toward hearings on this most important subject.●

SLAIN AMERICAN MISSIONARIES IN EL SALVADOR

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution relating to the issue of justice in the case of the slain American churchwomen in El Salvador. The same resolution was recently introduced in the Senate.

This particular case is familiar to many of us. The four victims—Jean Donovan, Dorothy Kazel, Ita Ford, and Maura Clark—were in El Salvador on a humanitarian mission. They were working with the poor and dispossessed, trying to rectify the problems that are causing all the current trouble in Central America. Jean Donovan, who was my constituent, left a $35,000 a year job in Cleveland to do her volunteer work with the church in El Salvador. The three religions were equally idealistic. Their murders at hands of unnamed government troops brought the brutality of the situation in El Salvador sharply and cruelly into focus for many Americans. The unresolved murder case serves as a continuing reminder to us of the injustice that reigns in that country.

The murders occurred nearly 3 years ago, on December 2, 1980. Repeatedly Congress has expressed its concern over the lack of any progress in the investigation. Repeatedly, we have heard the same excuses. Recently, the State Department admitted "disappointing progress in the case" and acknowledged a "virtual breakdown in criminal justice" in El Salvador. Government officials there have kept postponing a trial date. Critical evidence developed by the FBI to assist El Salvadoran authorities has never been introduced into the official court record. Other evidence has been lost or destroyed. Important leads have been ignored. In short, there is every reason to believe that the authorities in El Salvador have no intention to bring this case to trial, no intention to pursue justice.

The resolution I am introducing would put the House on record supporting the appointment of a special prosecuting attorney in El Salvador to oversee the comprehensive investigation of those responsible for murdering the four American church women and to prepare an effective prosecution. It is also clear that more than enough time has elapsed for reasonable people to expect a trial that would resolve the questions the American people continue to have as to who killed the American missionaries and who may have ordered the crime. The resolution calls on the Government of El Salvador to assure our Government that those accused will be brought before a jury trial by December 2, 1983, the third anniversary of the deaths of Jean Donovan, Ita Ford, Dorothy Kazel, and Maura Clark.

I urge support for the resolution to demonstrate to the families of the victims that we still care and to show foreign governments that we expect proper treatment for our citizens and justices should they become the victims of crime.

This resolution has also been introduced in the Senate.●

WASHINGTON PUD'S TESTIMONY ON THE SENATE WPPSS LEGISLATION

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, today the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is hearing testimony on a proposal to provide alternative financing for at least one of the troubled WPPSS nuclear plants.

In another recent statement in these pages, I have pointed out questions concerning this proposal.

At this time, I would commend to the attention of my colleagues the testimony presented to the Senate Energy Committee today by Mr. Jim Boldt, director of the Washington Public Utility Districts Association.

This testimony frames a number of other critical questions that must be addressed during congressional consideration of this energy financing proposal.

(Testimony follows:)

Good afternoon Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentleman:

My name is Jim Boldt. I am the Executive Director of the Washington Public Utility Districts' Association. Our Association represents 26 public utility districts in the State of Washington and their owner/ratepayers, as well as two joint operating agencies. The Association collectively represents over 500,000 electrical customers and systems that serve over 50 percent of the geographical area of the State of Washington.

We would like to thank you for the opportunity to testify on S. 1701. We were very concerned originally that there would be no chance for hearings and testimony on this issue. We truly appreciate the opportunity to express our views. We were pleased during the consideration of previous legislation that Senator Jackson expressed his concern for hearings and now as this bill comes forward we appreciate this committee's call for a hearing so that the public may be heard.

On July 26, 1983, the Board of Directors of the Washington Public Utility Districts' Association, with all but two members present, voted unanimously to endorse the following resolution:

Be it resolved that, the Washington P.U.D. Association opposes Section 317 of the pending Interior Department Appropriations Bill. While we appreciate the interest and attention of Congress toward our regional energy problems we feel that Section 317, as written, fails to adequately and comprehensively address these problems. We further call upon all regional energy entities, our ratepayers/owners, the private utilities, and others to continue the process initiated by Congress and the private utilities toward addressing our pressing energy problems. Such a continuation, with appropriate public hearings and input, combined with detailed studies of potential rate impacts, will allow us a proper forum to achieve a solution to our collective energy problems.

The Board of Directors of the Washington Public Utility Districts' Association is made up solely of locally elected public utility district commissioners. They took this action for the following reasons:

First, let me state that we support a completion of Washington Public Power Supply System project WNP 2. However, while this proposed legislation addresses that process, we have serious concerns over the broader aspect and timing of this legislation before you. Mr. Chairman we would like to put forth those concerns in this testimony. First, in the form of a technical critique of the language itself and then later in a general discussion about the energy situation in the Pacific Northwest, specifically the State of Washington.

We, the public utility districts, are customers of the Bonneville Power Administration. This federal agency is not a bureaucracy that merely represents a power mixer or exchanger for us. It is in many cases the life blood of power supply for the public utility districts. We therefore need to know more about any new authority granted to this federal agency before we can support it.

The legislation before us allows for the commitment and expenditure of our ratepayers' dollars through a new "entity." We are concerned about the makeup of this entity, how it would be established, who would establish it, and what its authorities and powers would be. Literally taken, if such an entity were to be formed that could issue this type of debt for this type of reason, we would imagine that under existing law we would see ourselves represented by perhaps a new giant irrigation district, a new state-wide public utility district, some other special purpose district, perhaps a state power authority, or in a whole different vein a new non-profit, private corporation over which we would imagine we would have very little control.

Control is a very important point for us these days. We are concerned about costs to our ratepayers. We are further concerned,

in light of the recent Washington State Supreme Court ruling, about entering into any agreements or being involved in agreements where the policy, oversight, and management control of our affairs are even further isolated from us. Recall if you will the clear statements by the Washington State Supreme Court in the Chemical Bank action. They ruled that without proper control, public utility districts lacked the authority to participate in contracts with a joint operating agency.

From a purely fiscal concern we are unable to obtain information about the possible financial obligation made by this entity pursuant to this legislation. We need answers. What would be the conditions of a loan to this entity? What would be the interest rate? What would be the terms of the loan? To whom would it be paid? What is the imagined time frame for refinancing as mentioned in the Committee report in Section 317 and this legislation? What if refinancing is unavailable?

As you are aware, project No. 1 was mothballed over one year ago in a similar fashion as the recent mothballing of project No. 3. It is not clear to us that the intent of this legislation is to provide new authority for project 1 as well as 2 and 3. It would be important to us that this be clarified and that the definition of "federal base system resource" be defined so that we know which resources could be funded or financed by this procedure. If the definition of "federal base system resource" is too broad this authority could be used for the purchase of new generators on the federal base system dams, perhaps fishery programs, conservation programs and others which could be funded from the federal base system revenues pursuant to the Pacific Northwest Regional Power Act.

The legislation makes reference to the term "cost of construction" and that funds from the entity could be used for such costs. It is essential that this term be further defined. We are concerned that such payments may take money from our ratepayers to pay disgruntled, terminated contractors at projects 1 and 3. Likewise we are concerned that money may be taken for cost sharing lawsuit settlements to pay projects 4 and 5 for which we presently have no authority to pay for, due to the decision of the Washington State Supreme Court.

There are additional questions in other areas which require answers in order to prepare comprehensive legislative solutions.

With our support for of completion project No. 2 and our concerns for the immediate needs for project No. 3 it would be wise to wait until the General Accounting Office has reported on the clarification of authority of the Bonneville Power Administration to fund construction of projects from rates. It would drastically realign support for various aspects of this legislation if we could hear the August 8th ruling by the Superior Court with regard to the cooperatively held utilities interests in projects 4 and 5.

We are also attempting to assess the cost-effectiveness and marketability of a major thermal resource (project No. 3) right in the middle of the Bonneville Power Administration's major reassessment of its rates and rate studies and load forecasts. It is impossible to assess the monetary impact of this legislation until these findings are made. And probably the most important point is to wait until the Regional Power Council can respond to a request for a cost-effective assessment of project No. 3. Those done prior to this time, in compliance with a now unconstitutional initiative, are now in question.

Allow us to discuss further the concerns we have with a forced march completion of any federal base system resource other than WNP No. 2. What are we going to do with project No. 3 if it is completed? If we use an unknown entity headed by yet to be announced personnel, to borrow an undetermined amount of money, at a "negotiable" interest rate to finish the project, what do we then have? Mr. Chairman, we have more surplus, and we have a diversion of capital from cost-effective conservation programs. (The Bonneville Power Administration has already asked the public utility districts of the State to assist in the financing of conservation programs to achieve Bonneville's responsibilities under the Regional Power Act.) We are hardly prepared to assist in that financing. However, we would be less able to assist if we are further strapped by untimely interest payments for the completion of a project we may not yet need. We are not sure No. 3 is needed immediately. We have nothing in place for out-of-region sales of our surplus thermal power. California does not want to purchase nuclear generated power, and they will not pay full thermal prices. A completion of the project now would further surplus the region with no clear progress for California sales.

Some agree that deferral of project No. 3 is more attractive than this mystery financing scheme. The costs are then not in the rate base and we get answers to the questions raised above relative to what California needs. The privately held utilities in the region would help buy up the surplus if they are short of power and Bonneville therefore will receive more revenue overall. It is important to point out that if the project is not completed, and if by chance (which we do not feel is the case) the investor-owned utilities are short of power at any time in the immediate future, the IOUs will purchase power from the Bonneville Power Administration at the new resource rate. This would bring more revenue to a fiscally beleaguered federal agency. If however, the project is completed, the privately held utilities could then buy surplus power at dump costs under a provision which allows them to shut down their expensive thermal resources in time of surplus and purchase the FBS surplus at its lowest cost. This of course reduces the potential revenue to Bonneville and hurts us all.

There is a good chance that if we proceed under this legislation to immediately complete project No. 3, sometime in the future WNP 4 and 5 may fall on top of us all. The question of bankruptcy is not discussed or mentioned in the proposed legislation. The issue of separation of plants 4 and 5 from 1, 2, and 3 and its possibility is not discussed. Without some assurance or clarification of this problem it seems imprudent to further obligate ratepayers to a questionably needed thermal plant if a bankruptcy of the Washington Public Power Supply System on projects 4 and 5 is going to bring havoc to the whole program.

Is it wise for the Congress and the utilities to proceed with project No. 3 in light of the present activity in the Springfield lawsuit in the State of Oregon? This lawsuit, as you know, will test the provisions of the projects 1, 2 and 3 Participants Agreements and the net billing agreements. If the Congress, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the utility officials did not or could not write binding contracts for the net-billed projects, should we spend more money before this is tested and ultimately cleared up? Mr. Ratcliffe of the Bonneville Power Administration stated before the Public Power Council meeting of July 26, 1983, that we would probably have to first test this new law in court. He further mentioned that this legislation is not the preferred approach that should be taken at this time.

If everything went ahead to finish project No. 3 there is serious questions as to how soon and how effectively the project could be brought back to full construction mode considering the delay already implemented. The most capable project manager, Mr. Leddick, has left the scene. Other key staff people have left or are leaving the project No. 3 site.

Another concern we'd like to place before the committee is if this legislation fails and if project 3 continues on its present course of deferred construction, is it in fact a dead project? Many have raised the question in the region that mothballing project 3 is essentially termination of the project. While no one can definitely answer that question, we can refer to the identical action taken on project No. 1. We can remember that the Bonneville Power Administration recommended that, of the two projects under consideration for mothballing at that time, project No. 1, which was the most complete and furthest along, was chosen for mothballing. There was absolutely no concern or consideration about bringing project No. 1 out of mothball and into full mode construction sometime in the future. We therefore have to assume that the same attitude is warranted for project No. 3. If project No. 1 can be mothballed and brought back on so can project No. 3.

We have been trying to assess the reason for the investor owned utilities insistence upon immediate completion of this project. Do they need the power? It appears they do not. Nearly every regional forecast shows that the region will be in a power surplus throughout the 1980's, even with a three year deferral of project No. 3. Furthermore, the IOU's already have access to inexpensive federal base system power for their residential and small farm customers through the exchange provisions of the Regional Power Act. And finally, of the four IOU's who are 30 percent owners of WNP 3 some admit in their own company's load forecasts, which continue to predict high levels of load growth, that even without project No. 3 they will remain surplus through the decade. In fact, some of the IOU's are already attempting to sell their portions of a coal plant scheduled to be completed within six months.

Another concern we have with this legislation is its provisions for agreement on construction schedules and scheduled need for power and marketability by the Bonneville Power Administration and "the project owners" (meaning the four investor-owned utilities with 30 percent of the project). Where is it that 70 percent of the participants and ultimate purchasers of this project have any say? Where is it that the vast majority effected by the project get to participate in the discussion of marketability, need and financing? The legislation decisively cuts out the public sector in these considerations that will obligate them for a major part of the costs.

It should also be noted that the Washington State House of Representatives Special Committee on Energy Development and Financing is studying possible legislation that should be coordinated with any action being

considered by Congress. Attached for your information is an outline of activity being considered by this committee.

Now I would like to briefly discuss some non-technical aspects of our concerns over this legislation. These concerns deal with the implementation of the Regional Power Act. The publicly held utilities were as supportive of this legislation as any sector. The final outcome has created a situation where it is unlikely a majority support could be mustered for the Regional Power Act at this time. The misgivings and ill feelings with the implementation of that legislation have made us shy with regard to legislative activity. The provisions designed to protect preference have seemed to dissipate. The rate test is proving difficult to implement and will probably have to be litigated. Many of these problems result from granting discretionary authority without adequate ability for public control. The legislation before us today proceeds without adequate protection of our ratepayer/owners and their share of the federal base system. We cannot support further discretionary authorities without proper procedural safeguards.

It is important for the Committee and public power utility officials to keep in mind that they represent customer/owners. We hear so much about the interest of stockholders that we often forget that our ratepayers are essentially our stockholders and to represent a concern about the financial impact on those people is as prudent and as responsible as those who cry out for the salvation of stockholders. The Washington Public Utility District Commissioners who are elected to regulate and oversee these publicly held utilities have and are witnessing a new and anxious interest in their utility systems. They have recently seen the recall of fellow commissioners who have been accused of being unresponsive to rates and of inadequately assessing Washington Public Power Supply System problem and its impact on those ratepayers. It is in the wake of this activity that an increased sensitivity on the part of PUD commissioners has arisen. They cannot and will not be party to a quick fix that, when later read in the light of day, causes problems similar to those being experienced in the implementation of the Regional Power Act.

The litigation mentioned earlier in the State of Oregon regarding the net-billing agreements has to become a major consideration in this legislation. When the public utility districts of the State of Washington call upon others to join in the drafting of a more comprehensive plan to solve the region's problems, wouldn't it be wiser that we wait to see if there is a necessity for the inclusion of a clarification of the net-billing agreements, rate financing by the Bonneville Power Administration, clarification of certain segments of the regional Power Act to protect our right to preference power, and perhaps an assessment and realignment of conditions under which surplus power can be sold outside the region with an interest to protect those of the region who need the power first?

In closing, I would like to mention what we have done and what we do support with regard to the Supply System projects. Enclosed for your information are sections of the Washington PUD Association's Resolution Committee Project. These two sections involve a regionalization program which we put forth to our members and was supported and later became the basis for discussions in Governor Spellman's negotiation attempt at this problem. And also the section pertaining to the Debt Reduction Plan which is self-explanatory and in our opinion was probably the last comprehensive train to leave the station with regard to this regional energy problem. It is unfortunate that leaders of the Bonneville Power Administration and other utilities lacked the foresight to support either of these projects at a time when they could have been implemented. Where we go from here is a more difficult task but we are still prepared to participate in a positive way.

Mr. Chairman I hope that these thoughts are helpful to you and your committee as you deliberate the problems before you. We know so well that they are unprecedented and will require every resource available to you. As stated in our resolution, we will call upon other utility officials, ratepayer interests, customer/owners of the utilities, and the Bonneville Power Administration to discuss with us during the month of August this problem and how we might together and collectively solve it. Thank you for this opportunity to testify. We would like to answer any questions you have and assist you in your deliberations in the future.●

CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to draw attention to the 30th anniversary of the American Political Science Association's congressional fellowship program. I know that many of my colleagues have benefited from this program, which places Federal executives, medical faculty, journalists, foreign professionals and political scientists in congressional offices for 10 months as legislative assistants.

I have had several fellows on my staff and they have all made vital contributions in a wide range of areas. Consistently, I have been impressed by the expertise and experience these fellows have brought to my office. Perhaps of even greated significance, I've found congressional fellows to be a highly motivated and energetic group of people who are eager to initiate projects and pursue objectives quickly and effectively.

The congressional fellowship program has grown from 6 fellows in 1953 to nearly 50 in 1983. While providing invaluable assistance to us on the Hill, the fellows are able to develop a better understanding of the legislative and political process. I can think of no better way for someone to learn how Congress operates than through the total immersion process that the APSA program offers, and I am certain that America benefits from the cross pollination of expertise which the APSA program provides.

On a more personal note, I would like to thank APSA for making it possible for me to benefit from the invaluable assistance I've received from congressional fellows on my staff.

I look forward to continued participation in the APSA congressional fellowship program. Even more importantly, I want to recommend this program to all of my colleagues.●

PROMPT PAY: SMALL BUSINESS NOW WANTS STATE ACTION

HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, last Congress we passed into law the Prompt Payment Act. This law requires the Government to pay its bills on time or else be charged interest on overdue bills.

A coalition of 21 business associations led the campaign for this new law. Kenton Pattie was director of the coalition and was instrumental in the passage of this law. This coalition has regrouped as the Coalition for State Prompt Pay, to encourage passage of similar legislation by States. Again, Kenton Pattie is the group's director.

I would like to include the following article from the August Nation's Business on this matter and commend Mr. Pattie for his continued hard work for our small business community.

[From Nation's Business, August 1983]

PROMPT PAY: SMALL BUSINESS NOW WANTS STATE ACTION

(By Grover Heiman)

Uncle Sam is earning a better reputation with small business by paying more of his bills on time. There is good reason for this improved performance: Under a new law, interest is due on the government's overdue bills.

During the first six months that the law was in force, government agencies paid interest totaling $518,000, according to the Office of Management and Budget.

"That's way below what anyone predicted," says Kenton Pattie, director of the Coalition for State Prompt Pay. "We thought it would be in the millions."

A coalition of 21 business associations led the campaign for passage by Congress of the Prompt Pay Act of 1982. Now that coalition has regrouped, with 23 members, as the Coalition for State Prompt Pay, to encourage passage of similar legislation by states.

Under the federal act, the government is supposed to pay contractors within 30 days of receiving an invoice. After 45 days, the government must pay interest on the amount of the bill, from the 31st day on. The interest rate is the current rate on five-year Treasury notes.

John J. Lordan, deputy associate director of finance and accounting for OMB, says that "there is a strong effort throughout government" to avoid interest penalties.

(OMB considers interest charges on late payments a waste of taxpayers' dollars—but it also frowns on early payment. OMB would like agencies to pay promptly at 30 days, no earlier and no later.)

Although, payment process has been vastly improved, some agencies still are not meeting the requirements of the act, which took effect last October 1.

One business told Pattie that payment of a bill for $97 was 212 days overdue from the Department of Health and Human Services. Other examples of bills not paid on time: Treasury Department, 242 days late on a bill for $38; Postal Service, 113 days, on a bill for $781; and the Central Intelligence Agency, 78 days, on one for $79.

"From the reports I've received," Pattie says, "the Defense Department is the worst offender." The Pentagon had to pay more than $300,000 in interest on overdue bills—more than half the governmentwide total—during the first six months under the act.

Pattie says the Navy in particular has generated complaints, with small businesses citing a number of bills more than 500 days overdue and several more than 800 days overdue. OMB has written to the Defense Department about the Navy problems.

One agency created problems for itself by not starting the 30-day count until an invoice had traveled through a number of offices and arrived at the finance center. OMB has corrected that misunderstanding.

Pattie says, however, that some federal agencies' performances have been better than expected, and some have been outstanding—even some within the Defense Department.

For example, when Navy Captain Gerald Langer arrived in 1981 to take over the Defense Contract Agency's Philadelphia regional office, which spends $4 billion a year, he found that 40 percent of the bills were being paid late. Langer has that overdue total down to 5 percent; since the Prompt Pay Act went into effect, his office has had to pay only several hundred dollars in interest on overdue bills.

The Prompt Pay Act, Pattie says, has proven that without interest penalties the federal customer has no incentive to respond to complaints about overdue bills, although the Reagan administration and previous administrations have pushed for prompt payment.

At the time the federal law was passed, 14 states—Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina and Washington—had some form of prompt pay act.

Since then, such legislation has been enacted by 12 more states—Colorado, Delaware, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Montana, Nevada, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah and Wyoming.

A major target of the State Prompt Pay Coalition is the District of Columbia, which Pattie calls one of the country's most sluggish bill payers. Among examples he cites: a $5,277 bill for rental of a truck by the University of the District of Columbia was 947 days overdue on May 20. (The bill has since been paid.)

The coalition sees passage of a prompt pay act by the District as setting the stage for a third thrust, at city and county governments and school districts. "Small businesses report that they have been forced to put hundreds of cities and school districts on 'credit hold,' with cash on delivery required for every purchase," the coalition says.

But for the time being, the coalition is urging small business to keep the spotlight on state governments, to encourage them to pass laws establishing payment standards for all state institutions, including hospitals and universities, and to apply those laws whenever state funds are expended by local governments.

Supporters of prompt payment bills see the issue as fairness. Says Alabama state Senator Bill Cabannis, sponsor of one bill: "I don't think that requiring payment in 45 days is a harsh requirement."●

GIVE PEOPLE FOOD, NOT SILLY STUDIES

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the complete pointlessness of Reagan's just announced 90-day study to look at why people are hungry and what the Federal Government can do about it is indicative of Reagan's efforts to feed the hungry. I could tell President Reagan what the hungry people of this country need in 90 seconds. Food, Mr. Speaker, food, food, food.

These people need food; and they cannot eat paper studies. This is a gut issue, literally, not one of the mind. It has already been well-documented that the problem is there. One only need look at the lines for the cheese give-aways or at the soup kitchens around the country. The U.S. Conference of Mayors issued the latest hunger report in June entitled "Hunger in American Cities." The problem is lack of food, not lack of study.

Reagan says that it would be a national tragedy if even one child or elderly person went hungry. Oakland has 30,000 of these national tragedies every day. Part of this is the result of feeding program and food stamp cutbacks that the Reagan administration has taken pride in.

I suggest, Mr. President, that you take the money that would be spent on the study and use it to pay distribution costs on surplus Government food to help it reach those hungry people that you have suddenly discovered. Or better yet, how about sending 50,000 pounds of cheese to El Salvador and giving $50 million to the hungry poor people in the United States.●

SOVIETS TAKE A NEW APPROACH IN THEIR FORGERY CAMPAIGN

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the State Department Friday released information about a fake tape recording of a telephone conversation between President Reagan and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher which further documents the wide range of Soviet active measures operations being waged against the United States and our allies.

The tape was obtained by the U.S. Embassy in Amsterdam, 1 week prior to the May British Parliament elections. It sought to discredit both Prime Minister Thatcher, through references to the Falklands war, and President Reagan, on the issue of U.S. intermediate range nuclear missiles in Europe. The tape juxtaposed statements President Reagan made during a November 1982 speech on nuclear disarmament with statements made by Prime Minister Thatcher. The result was a forged telephone conversation between the two leaders of the free world which was sent anonymously with a cover letter to Dutch journalists.

Soviet disinformation campaigns such as this are widespread, and have at my urging been the subject of numerous hearings by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The committee has heard testimony from Ladislav Bittman, the former Deputy Chief of the Disinformation Service of the Czechoslovakia Intelligence Service, and Stanislav Levchenko, a former KGB active measures officer assigned to Tokyo, Japan. Both men provided firsthand accounts of a variety of Soviet attempts to undermine the credibility of the United States and its allies throughout the world.

Although much of the information during our hearings is classified, I have urged the chairman as well as the CIA and FBI to release more evidence of Soviet propaganda efforts to better inform the American people of the extent to which the Soviets will go in their quest for world domination.

That is why I was pleased that the State Department released information Friday concerning the forged telephone conversation. Not only is it important to cite another active measures operation, but it was even more valuable to our intelligence sources because it represents the first known forged Soviet tape recording.

In testimony to our committee last year, the CIA estimated that the Soviets spend between $3 and $4 billion a year on their active measures campaign. This being the case, the Soviet forgeries we are able to identify represent only a small proportion of those planted by the Soviets. It is important to understand that many Soviet forgeries often appear to be insignificant because only a few words or phrases have been changed. Over the course of time, however, these minor alterations fit neatly together into a carefully orchestrated effort to undermine U.S. policies.

That is why findings such as the forged tape recording are so valuable and need to be publicized. It is my intention to make these types of find-

ings public when at all possible to build the record of Soviet deceit and propaganda and alert the American people to the growing threat we face from the Soviet Union.●

COMMENDING JAMES WINSTON

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to commend Mr. James Winston, a longtime resident of my district from Carson, Calif., for his outstanding leadership in the community and continued professional success.

Mr. Winston was recently elected president of the National Funeral Directors and Morticians' Association. On August 11, 1983, he will be officially installed as president at their annual conference in Detroit, Mich.

James Winston was born in Marlin, Tex. He attended the public schools in Marlin and graduated from Booker T. Washington High School. In the fall of 1946, he continued his education at Texas College of Science in Fort Worth, Tex. After moving to El Paso, Tex. in 1947, he attended Desboine Business College. He also began his professional career in El Paso at Banks Funeral Home.

In 1951, he moved to Los Angeles, Calif. He served his country in the U.S. Army from 1952 to April 1955. His basic leadership training was in Fort Ord, Calif. and New York. He served in the European Theater.

After receiving an honorable discharge from the service, Mr. Winston returned to Los Angeles and continued to pursue his career in the funeral industry and his education. He attended Los Angeles City College and California College of Insurance at Pasadena, Calif. He was employed by South Los Angeles Mortuary until 1974. He served as general manager for the firm and while there, he was employed part time by the Los Angeles Transit Co.

Mr. Winston is a member of Macedonia Baptist Church and serves as a deacon. He has served as president of the sanctuary choir. He is also past president of the Sunday school and B.T.U. Congress of the Western Baptist State Convention.

James Winston is very active in community affairs. He is a member of the NAACP, YMCA, Watts/Willowbrook Rotary Club, Southern Area Boys' Club, Democratic Voters League, president of the California Chapter of Booker T. Washington Alumni of Marlin, Tex., Rising Sun Masonic Lodge, Esther Chapter O.E.S., honorary member of El Paso, Texas Club—Los Angeles Chapter, and the Dorie Miller Hero Charity Club No. 2.

Professionally, Mr. Winston is proprietor and president of the House of Winston Mortuary, Inc. His memberships include the National Funeral Directors and Morticians' Association and he has served as chairman of the VIII District Education Committee; secretary of the board of directors; chairman of the board of directors; vice president of the National Funeral Directors and Morticians' Association, and presently is the president-elect. He is a member of the California Funeral Directors' Association, Los Angeles County Funeral Directors.

Among the many awards he has received for personal, civil, and professional achievement are the Outstanding Business Award of the year, presented by A.C.C. Pauline Awards; Humanitarian Award presented by the El Paso Club, Los Angeles Chapter; Sharing and Caring Award given by Grace Lewis, principal of Victory Baptist Day School.

James Winston is a resident of Carson, Calif., married to Mary Louise Winston, and the father of Harold and Felicia Winston. He was an active member of the citizens committee for the incorporation of the city of Carson and a past officer of the Centerview Homeowners Association.

Mr. Speaker, James Winston is a man who deserves to be honored and recognized for his many achievements and his contributions to the community. I am very pleased to honor such a fine citizen and family man. James Winston has set an example of community service that we can all follow.●

LAS CASUELAS: THE SILVER ANNIVERSARY OF A TRULY FINE MEXICAN-AMERICAN TRADITION

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, when my wife, Lee, and I are able to escape to Palm Springs for a brief rest from my many responsibilities as the Representative of California's 32d Congressional District, we invariably look forward to a festive evening accentuated by fine food and drink, mariachis, and the warm glow of happy patrons at Las Casuelas Terraza.

All of the guests who visit Las Casuelas Terraza or any of the other fine restaurants owned by Florencio and Mary Delgado are being invited to join in celebrating the silver anniversary of the original hacienda-style restaurant, Las Casuelas. Twenty-five years ago, on February 1, 1958, Las Casuelas opened its doors. Since then, the Delgado's have opened two other establishments: Las Casuelas Terraza and Las Casuelas Nuevas.

Each Delgado establishment is attended to by members of the immediate family. Florencio and Mary devote most of their time to Las Casuelas. Daughter Patti and her husband, Ric Service, are entrusted with upholding fine Mexican traditions and keeping guests enlivened at Las Casuelas Terraza. Insuring that the fifth generation recipes—the hallmark of each restaurant—are not compromised at Las Casuelas Nuevas in Rancho Mirage are son Joaquin and daughter Florence. There is a second son, Robert, who it is hoped also will continue this honored Mexican-American tradition.

Palm Springs as the home for the Delgado family represents the completion of a struggle begun well before Florencio's birth under a tent used to house copper miners and their families in Jerome, Ariz. It was in those mines that Florencio's late father, Emilio Delgado, was employed. Emilio and his wife, Maria Hernandez Delgado, came to Jerome after fleeing their native Sinaloa, Mexico, in search of opportunity and stability during one of the more turbulent periods in our southern neighbor's history. It is a truly eloquent commentary that, in the United States, members of a family who, like the Delgado's, are tenacious will more often succeed than fail.

Such a will to persevere following the tragic loss of Florencio's father has always been demonstrated by Maria and her son. Drawing on recipes she had learned from her grandmother, Maria and her son relocated in many small towns throughout Arizona and California. In those towns they set up makeshift restaurants, where Maria prepared her foods for all who were willing to enjoy them. This was the setting for Florencio's introduction to the restaurant business.

Following a tour of duty with the U.S. Navy and shortly after the close of World War II, Florencio and his bride, Mary, asked his mother to help them found the Spanish Kitchen in Colton, CA. But the State's urbanization plans brought a disruption to the Delgado's moderate success and compelled their move to Palm Springs, which at that time only remotely resembled Palm Springs as we now know it. Today Palm Springs is an oasis and Las Casuelas and Las Casuelas Terraza are two of its very popular attractions.

Mr. Speaker, Lee and I wish to commemorate the silver anniversary of Las Casuelas by sharing with our colleagues just how proud we are of what the Delgado family has achieved. The pride of that family fills the air of each of their restaurants. All who enter feel their warmth and quickly recognize that something very special awaits them. We look forward to again being in their company and wish them at least another 25 years of uncompromising excellence.●

NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE ORDER SONS OF ITALY

HON. PETER W. RODINO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am exceptionally proud that my home State of New Jersey has been chosen to host the National Convention of the Order Sons of Italy this year. It is the first time that New Jersey has been the site of this annual convention in nearly 40 years, and I am pleased to recognize this event, which will be held in Atlantic City, August 18-21.

As one who is very proud of my Italian heritage, I take special pleasure in having this opportunity to note the outstanding work of the order over the years. As the Nation's oldest and largest organization of Americans of Italian background, the Order Sons of Italy in America boasts a widely diversified program of educational, social, civic, charitable, legislative, and patriotic activities. Since its founding in 1905, at a time when Italian immigrants new to our shores united together in one organization to preserve their rich cultural heritage, members of this group have continued to maintain that tradition and pride in that heritage.

It is with great pleasure that I salute the Order Sons of Italy—and the State of New Jersey which counts among its people a great many Italian-Americans—and offer all my best wishes for a successful convention.●

TIME TO END TERRORISM

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, in August 1896, a group of young Armenian revolutionaries seized the Ottoman Bank in Istanbul, Turkey and threatened to blow it up if Sultan Adbul Hamid II, the Ottoman ruler, did not put an end to the massacres of innocent Armenians and make the reforms introduced in the Treaty of Berlin.

They were promised that the massacres would cease and the reforms would be carried out. However, the massacres escalated and the reforms were not implemented.

Last Wednesday, nearly 87 years later, another group of young Armenian revolutionaries took over the home of the Turkish Ambassador in Lisbon, Portugal and threatened to blow it up if the Armenian people's demands for justice were not recognized.

Saying that "the wall of silence around the Armenian cause was too thick to break," they blew up the building and remained under its collapse.

This fatal act marked an upsurge in the terrorist attacks carried out by extremist Armenian groups which, in the past 10 years, have been trying to draw attention to the injustice perpetrated against the Armenian people.

Although I strongly deplore their violent tactics, I must admit that these youths did make a crack in "the wall of silence."

While the Turkish rulers and the rest of the world did not immediately take steps to address the true cause of the terrorism, the media extensively reported on this latest act and published numerous editorials on the solution to the problem of Armenian terrorism.

Interestingly enough, many of these recent editorials called for the same action that some of us in Congress have been proposing for the past several years. Editorial after editorial concluded that Turkey should come to grips with its past and open dialog with representatives of the Armenian community in the diaspora.

Unfortunately, instead of listening to this voice of reason, Turkish rulers, time and time again, have stubbornly refused to properly deal with the grievances of the Armenian people.

In 1895 and 1896, Sultan Abdul Hamid II tried to suppress the Armenian demands for justice and reforms by killing up to 300,000 innocent Armenian men, women, and children.

In 1915, the young Turk government tried to close the book on the "Armenian question" by ordering the forced deportation and systematic massacre of the Armenian people.

In 1920, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, the founder of present day Turkey, collaborated with the Soviets and attacked the 2-year-old independent Republic of Armenia. This final blow led to the present day division of the Armenian homeland between Turkey and the Soviet Union.

Today, the Turkish Government not only refuses to come to terms with its past, but insists on distorting this truth by closing access to its archives, fabricating data, and pressuring other countries into denouncing the occurance of the genocide of the Armenian people.

This fantic denial of due process and justice along with the distortion of history fuels the fire and creates the frustration which leads desperate Armenian youths to resort to acts of terrorism.

However, an acknowledgement of the occurance of the genocide and the initiation of sincere dialog will have just the opposite effect. It would remove the impetus for the terrorism. With the situation having been diffused and the frustration relieved, there would be little reason for the extremist Armenians to exist and pursue their violent tactics.

As a good ally and friend of Turkey, I think it is our duty to point this out to the Turkish leadership. And, as a nation with a longstanding commitment to truth, liberty, and justice, the United States should insist on having Turkey recognize history for what it is and open dialog with representatives of the Armenian community in the diaspora.●

NATIONAL HOSIERY WEEK

HON. ROBIN C. BRITT

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. BRITT. Mr. Speaker, as the American hosiery manufacturing industry is important to our Nation and particularly the State of North Carolina, I feel it is timely and appropriate that we draw attention to the fact that the industry will be celebrating National Hosiery Week August 14-20, 1983. The hosiery industry generates annual wages of over $700 million each year to the 63,900 people employed in its 417 plants around the country. And with over 50 percent of the hosiery industry located in the State of North Carolina and with the employment of over 43,000 North Carolinians, it generates approximately $470 million in annual wages in North Carolina alone.

Epitomized by small- and medium-size firms, the hosiery industry provides jobs and income for families in numerous communities—many of them small and rural in nature. These Americans produce and market over 6 billion dollars worth of innovative, stylish products for the use and comfort of all of us.

Our congratulations and appreciation to this vibrant manufacturing segment of our economy during this 13th annual celebration of National Hosiery Week.●

URGENT NEED FOR BANKING MORATORIUM LEGISLATION

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I have received an excellent letter of July 15, 1983, from one of my constituents Dan Voegeli, Estate and Pension Services, Inc., of Fulton, KY. I believe my colleagues will be interested in Mr. Voegeli's comments and concerns regarding H.R. 3499 and H.R. 3413.

His letter follows:

JULY 15, 1983

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUBBARD:

I am writing this letter to ask for your help and consideration in a matter that I feel needs immediate attention. It appears that the large banking and savings and loan interests are very rapidly moving to place themselves in the position of underwriting and marketing all lines of insurance. I feel this will lead to serious conflicts of interest on the part of the lending institution which could result in the consumer losing his freedom of choice with respect to where he purchases his insurance.

Several years ago a client in Union City, Tennessee was "advised" by his banker to drop existing insurance he had purchased from me in favor of more expensive coverage proposed by an insurance agency in which the banker had an interest. This occurred while the client was obtaining a loan from the banker. The banker confirmed his advice to me when I confronted him verbally; naturally, he refused to write a letter to either the client or myself outlining his recommendation.

From my personal experience the conflict reared its ugly head when it was clearly against the law for there to be self-serving outside interest. When some air of legality is offered I would expect such dealing to be much more widespread.

Carroll, I feel the banking interests are creating a panic in the market place which is leading to a breakdown in the traditional policy of having separate control of banking and other commercial organizations. It is my understanding that two pieces of proposed legislation are presently coming up for consideration, H. R. 3499 and H. R. 3413 which would place a moratorium on all parties. I would appreciate your giving thought to co-sponsoring one of these bills and calling for hearings by your banking committee on the moratorium legislation as soon as possible.

Thank you for your time and consideration. If I can ever be of assistance please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

DAN VOEGELI, CLU●

TV'S LOOSE CONTROL KNOB

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, since the Communications Act of 1934 was enacted, the comparative renewal process has served as the primary mechanism through which a broadcaster's license could be challenged in order to insure broadcaster responsiveness to community needs.

The question of how best to provide this accountability must be central to our deliberations as this Congress considers the merits of removal or modification of the comparative renewal standard.

Recently, the Christian Science Monitor editorialized on the ramifications of broadcast deregulation. I commend this thought provoking editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 5, 1983]

TV'S LOOSE CONTROL KNOB

Deregulation—which has already reshaped such key US industries as airlines, railroads, and trucking—could soon be on its way to the nation's television stations. And if that happens, as many experts now believe it will, the impact could be far-reaching on what Americans are able to watch, or not able to watch, on their TV screens.

The broadcasting industry has long pushed for deregulation, a goal also favored by the Reagan administration. Last month the Federal Communications Commission's substantial deregulation of radio stations in 1981 was upheld in a federal appeals court case. Now the FCC—spurred by its chairman, Mark Fowler—is calling for a deregulation of the nation's commercial TV stations. The commission is seeking public comment on a number of options that would sharply curtail current FCC regulation.

The American public needs to be aware that proposed actions would, among other things, do the following:

Modify or end the commission's watchdog role over programming, including public affairs and community service shows.

Modify or end current requirements that at least 10 percent of all programs be nonentertainment shows and that no more than 16 minutes of commercials be broadcast in any one-hour period.

Leave the matter of whether or not a station was presenting adequate public service programming solely up to possible rivals during a license renewal challenge. As it is, the FCC itself keeps tabs on such programming.

Present political "equal time" requirements are statutory in nature and would not be changed by deregulation.

There is a strong case that the broadcasting industry—indeed, all major industries in the United States—should be freed up from unnecessary red tape and bookkeeping requirements. But the broadcasting industry is quite distinct from other industries. For one thing, at least in the case of over-the-air TV stations, there are still a limited number of available channels. Moreover, the programming comes right into the home.

Mr. Fowler and other proponents of deregulation argue that such traditional reasons for regulating TV stations are no longer logical in an age of multi-channel cable TV and new satellite-to-home delivery systems. But is that yet the case when millions of Americans still do not have cable TV? At some point down the road, perhaps most households will have access to a genuine diversity of television outlets. But until that occurs, it would seem wise to move cautiously.

The approach of Congressman Timothy Wirth, chairman of a House subcommittee dealing with deregulation, seems reasonable. Mr. Wirth would link a long-range deregulation plan to a requirement that commercial TV stations be required to provide a certain amount of public affairs and local programming. By contrast, a deregulation measure that passed the Senate earlier this year would eliminate comparative renewal standards and would allow the FCC to make but a cursory analysis that a station's programming was meeting local needs.

Many stations have already found it more profitable to show repeats of popular network programs than to broadcast local programs, particularly programs serving minorities. At the same time, the professional codes of good taste pertaining to commercials have virtually been scrapped, although stations are still voluntarily policing commercials.

What it all adds up to is that, first, this is hardly the moment to peremptorily end FCC scrutiny of public affairs and local programs; second, more not less scrutiny is warranted to ensure there is any local access at all.●

WORLDWIDE MARRIAGE ENCOUNTER

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, Worldwide Marriage Encounter will hold their annual convention in Philadelphia on August 12 to 14, 1983. Marriage Encounter is primarily dedicated to helping couples make their marriages better. The convention will bring together thousands of couples, priests, and religious to share the Marriage Encounter concept.

Since its founding by a Spanish priest in 1962, Marriage Encounter has expanded to 57 countries around the world. Worldwide Marriage Encounter can claim a membership in the United States of 250,000 couples. Millions of people have participated in encounter weekends.

The theme of the convention is "That We May Be One." Those attending will be asked to focus on the unity of their married relationship and their relationship with their family. Worldwide Marriage Encounter also serves those with a religious vocation. In this way, Marriage Encounter ministers to all of those who devote their lives to others.

I urge my colleagues to consider the message of Marriage Encounter: If we are able to communicate, we can learn to share ourselves with each other.

I want to take this opportunity to welcome Worldwide Marriage Encounter to Philadelphia, and to offer my best wishes for a successful meeting.●

TEFLON-COATED BULLETS

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, during recent months numerous postcards have caused me to examine in some detail the question of teflon-coated bullets and their effect on police safety. I have arrived at some conclusions I would like to share with the House. Let us consider the following: First, the general relationship between armor and projectiles. Second, the nature, virtues, and limitations of the Kevlar vests now used by police.

Third, the nature and significance of teflon-coated bullets. Finally, the pros and cons of legislation designed to prohibit these bullets in the interest of police safety.

The general relationship between armor and projectiles can be stated in two propositions: There is no armor which cannot be penetrated, and there is no projectile which cannot be stopped. It depends on how much you are willing to carry around.

Imagine, if you will, a short .22-caliber bullet propelled at low velocity by a very small amount of hand-loaded powder. At the other extreme, imagine also a 30-millimeter projectile from the Gatling gun carried by the A-10 antitank aircraft: a depleted uranium bullet, as long as your hand, weighing several pounds and with very high velocity.

What armor can protect against the slow .22? Almost anything, possibly including a stiff leather jacket. What armor can protect against the 30-millimeter high-kinetic-energy round? Not much in existence today; it can wipe out any tank in the Soviet inventory. But possibly the armor on the Abrams tank is sufficient.

Anyone desiring full armor protection, then, might decide to go around dressed in an Abrams tank. But he would have two problems: First, the weight and bulk of the armor obviously render it impractical. Second, anyone wishing to do him harm could simply bring a more powerful gun, although he too would have weight problems.

So every type of armor between leather jacket and Abrams tank will protect its wearer against some projectiles but not against others. The wearer faces a tradeoff between protection and discomfort.

The Kevlar vests sometimes used by police offer a good tradeoff. They give remarkably high protection at a remarkably low level of discomfort. They will stop 95 percent of all small arms bullet types. They are light and flexible, and they can be concealed under normal clothing. They are not bullet proof. They are only bullet resistant. But make no mistake: They can be penetrated by a large variety of bullets.

One of these is the teflon-coated bronze bullet called KTW, which is the cause of currently pending legislation. Let us consider a few facts about this bullet:

One. The teflon is not used to add penetrativity, but to reduce wear on the gun barrel.

Two. These bullets are not and never have been publicly available. They are sold directly by the manufacturer, to military and law enforcement agencies only.

Three. Although the KTW has been in production for 13 years, no police officer has been killed by one penetrating Kevlar body armor.

Four. There is a heavy-duty form of body armor which will stop the KTW. Since it contains steel inserts I assume it is less comfortable than standard soft armor, although I have not worn a steel-insert vest and do not know from personal experience.

Five. Other forms of ammunition exist, both off the shelf and hand loaded, which will penetrate body armor lacking steel inserts. Any legislation prohibiting bullets which can penetrate Kevlar armor will necessarily prohibit not only the KTW but a large variety of hunting and target ammunition.

Six. There is no practical way to draw a line between armor-piercing and non-armor-piercing ammunition. All armor does not rely on the same properties, nor do all penetrators. Bullet A may penetrate armor X but not armor Y, while bullet B may penetrate armor Y but not armor X. Which is the penetrator?

Seven. There is no such thing as abstract ammunition. Any definition of the armor-penetrating properties of a bullet must specify that it be test-fired from a certain type of gun. But then ammunition found acceptable could become penetrating if fired from a gun imparting higher velocity. Similarly, prohibited ammunition could become acceptable if fired from a shorter barrel imparting lower velocity. If it is to be valid, an armor-penetrating prohibition would have to specify specific ammunition-gun combinations, of which there are probably tens of thousands, with new ones constantly appearing. This is unworkable.

Eight. No form of armor will protect its wearer against a hit in an area not covered by the armor.

Nine. For budgetary reasons, many police forces do not have as many sets of body armor as they need. Many police officers who want and need armor do not have it available to them.

Where does all this lead us with respect to legislation prohibiting the KTW and other armor-penetrating bullets? For my part, I am led to two conclusions:

First, I am led to respect the motives of its sponsors. They are capable, conscientious people who mean well. Certainly, the safety of police officers is a paramont concern. But then so are the rights of gun owners.

Second, I am led to disagree with their conclusions and to oppose their legislation.

It seems to me that this legislation addresses a problem which does not exist: Deaths of police officers due to bullets penetrating Kevlar body armor. There have been none.

Further, it seems to me that this legislation would fail to solve the problem if it did exist: A sophisticated assassin could always hand load his ammunition or aim for unarmored parts of the body. An unsophisticated criminal, on the other hand, will not have armor-penetrating ammunition—it is very expensive—at all. While a mid-range criminal might be hypothesized, in practice he does not exist.

Finally, it seems to me that this legislation fails to address a very real problem: the shortage of Kevlar armor. The need to protect Kevlar vests against special ammunition is hypothetical; the need to get more police under Kevlar is concrete.

If we are to meet the real need, our best course is to help police departments buy armor for their people. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with the Justice Department. I intend to give this matter particular attention.

This, I suggest to my colleagues is the way to save police lives. Banning special bullets will not help. Buying more Kevlar vests for more police will help. That is what we need to do.●

A TRAGEDY IN INDIA

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I talked about a terrible car accident near Agra, India. The car-truck crash on June 30, 1983, claimed the life of Embassy officer, Charles F. Soper, and retired USIA photographer, R. N. Khanna. Two other USIS employees, Ms. Virginia Warfield and Mike Pipkin were badly injured in that accident. The group was returning to Bombay after assisting in the visit of Secretary of State George Shultz to India.

I just learned that Ms. Warfield passed away on July 12, at Clark Field Air Force Hospital in the Philippines as the result of her injuries. Mr. Pipkin is recovering at George Washington University Hospital here in Washington, D.C.

Virginia was an 18-year veteran with USIA. At the time of her death, she was serving as the cultural affairs officer to the USIA branch post in Bombay, India.

Virginia was born in Howard County, Md., and graduated from the University of Maryland and Stanford University.

After joining USIA in 1965, she served in a variety of USIS assignments in Cameroon, Madagascar, Ethiopia, Rwanda. She also had several assignments at USIA's headquarters in Washington, D.C., where she worked in the film, TV, and research section of the African Bureau. Her survivors include four sisters and two brothers. My heartfelt sympathy goes out to her

family in this hour of sadness. I, too, share their loss and their grief.

I hope that I can give her family some consolation in saying that Virginia died in the service of her country. Over the years, she performed a vital role in working for her country in many hardship posts where the challenges to an American official are often greater than most of us in this Congress can imagine. As a career professional in the USIA, she played an important part in telling America's story to the world, and contributed to American understanding of other diverse lands. This is no mean task during this period of international tension and misunderstanding. She was loved and respected by her friends and colleagues around the world. She will be missed.

I also want to send my sympathy to the family of R. N. Khanna, a former Foreign Service local USIS photographer, who came out of retirement to photograph the recent visit of our Secretary of State to India. His dedication and many years of service to our Government are appreciated.●

SBA DISCRIMINATES AGAINST SMALL BUSINESS IN POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, the SBA's pollution control loan program was set up to help small business obtain long-term, reasonable rate financing for Government-mandated pollution control expenditures. The SBA used their authority under the program to guarantee tax-exempt issues that small businesses used to finance pollution control expenditures. Investors were offered Government guaranteed, tax-free bonds, and small businesses were able to obtain long-term, low-rate financing for nonrevenue producing expenditures.

By all measures, the program has been a success. It even generates revenues for the Federal Treasury from the management fees collected from the participating small businesses. The management fee is supposed to cover SBA's losses from the program, but the default rate has been so low that SBA's losses have been covered by the interest earned on the loan reserve pool.

The SBA, however, has not made a tax-exempt pollution control loan since December 30, 1981. In the first 10 months of fiscal year 1983, they have used only $12 million of the $225 million authorized for the program, and all of those guarantees were for taxable issues. In fact, the program has been almost dead since January 2, 1982, even though at the time, 98 applications were pending for $181 million. You see, despite the wishes of Congress, the SBA has made it their policy to discriminate against pollution control loan guarantee applications that are to be used in conjunction with tax-exempt financing.

What makes this SBA policy so outrageous is the fact that big businesses can and do finance their pollution control expenditures with tax-exempt bonds. In the first quarter of 1983, big businesses issued $513 million in tax-exempt pollution control bonds. That is twice the amount Congress authorized for all of small business in all of fiscal year 1983. And the SBA has not used one single dollar of their authorization to help small business get tax-exempt pollution control financing in 20 months.

Even worse, this administration, while in the process of denying small businesses access to this vital program, is making money of the fees they have collected from small businesses who participated in the program in past years. Of the $38.5 million in the SBA's pollution control equipment revolving loan fund, $23.7 million is income generated by fees from small business, and $5.6 million is the interest income from these fees.

Mr. Speaker, the SBA is not just discriminating against small business, it is breaking a bond of trust by denying them access to a program that their hard-earned dollars help support.

I suggest that this administration take a hard look at how their policy decisions in this area are hurting small businesses in America. SBA policies are supposed to help small business, not discriminate against them.

The following letter from the SBA contains up-to-date information about SBA's pollution control loan guarantee program:

U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1983.

Hon. BERKLEY BEDELL,
U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on General Oversight and the Economy, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEDELL: This is in response to your letter of July 12, 1983, in which you requested up-to-date information on the Small Business Administration's Pollution Control Loan Guarantee Program.

The following is the specific information you requested in the order of your questions:

1. Q. When was the last SBA pollution control loan guarantee that was issued in conjunction with a tax-exempt industrial development bond?

A. December 30, 1981.

2. Q. How many pollution control loan guarantees issued in conjunction with taxable financing has the SBA approved since the last tax-exempt guarantee was approved?

A. Seven.

3. Q. How many pollution control loan guarantees issued in conjunction with taxable financing has the SBA approved in the history of the program? How many guarantees have been approved to be used in conjunction with tax-exempt IDBs?

A. Seven taxable, two hundred thirty seven (237) tax-exempt.

4. Q. What is the historical default information on SBA pollution control loan guarantees issued in conjunction with taxable financing? Non-taxable financing?

A. Through June 30, 1983: Taxable financing, none; Tax-exempt financing, 19 companies in default, claims filed and payments made on 17 companies totalling $5,630,713.

5. Q. What is the present unexpended authority in the SBA's pollution control loan guarantee program for fiscal year 1983? How much has been approved so far this year?

A. $212,995,000 of the total amount authorized of $225,000,000. A total of $12,005,000 was approved in fiscal year 1983.

6. Q. How many applications for SBA pollution control loan guarantees to be issued in conjunction with taxable financing were pending on January 1, 1982? January 1, 1983? How many are pending today? What are the figures for those applications pending for use with nontaxable financing?

	Taxable	Tax-exempt
A. Jan. 1, 1982—	0	$98 to $180,968,243.
none.		
Jan. 1, 1983—4	$8,420,000	0 to 0.
July 15, 1983—1	5,000,000	0 to 0.

7. Q. What is the current balance in the pollution control equipment revolving loan fund? How much of this money was generated by fees collected from the companies using the program, and separately, how much interest have these funds accrued?

A. As of June 30, 1983:

Balance in the fund	$38,521,454
Income generated from fees	23,731,457
Interest income	5,601,697

Thank you for your interest in this program. If you have any other questions or need more information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

EDWIN T. HOLLOWAY,
Associate Administrator for Finance and Investment.●

A NEW PROPOSAL FOR THE START TALKS

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, today, the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks in Geneva adjourned for 2 months. Tomorrow, the Congress will adjourn for 6 weeks. What happens during the two recesses now beginning is of critical importance.

The decisions we have reached about the MX missile are fragile. This fall, the debate will begin again and the outcome is anything but predictable. All of us would agree, however, that much depends on whether, when Congress returns, the administration is ready to unveil an approach to arms

control that convincingly blends the MX and the single warhead ICBM into a new START negotiating position focused on stability. This new position must speak for itself.

Opponents of the MX believe that it cannot be used effectively in negotiations, and that there is no way in which it might be compatible with an outcome based on a mutually stable nuclear relationship with the Soviet Union. Those who are uncritical supporters of the MX are, on the other hand, intent on acquiring the missile as an end and a good in itself.

At the moment, these two forces are almost precisely in balance, a handful of votes makes the difference. And that handful of votes, at least as of this moment, is in the keeping of a small group of Members whose view of the MX is not absolute, but relative.

In my opinion, a judgment of the MX cannot be made in isolation from the context in which the missile is to be employed. I am prepared to accept as plausible that the viability of this missile, which could not be secured by the most ingenious engineering concepts, might be obtained through arms control. I am prepared to accept that unless we are ready to produce and deploy the MX, the kind of arms control we need will elude us. And I do not find it unthinkable that, in the end, numbers of these missiles will have to be deployed in the course of a shift away from MIRV'd ICBM's, toward smaller, and mutually stable forces.

These are propositions I raised for the consideration of my colleagues on two earlier occasions, on March 22, 1982 and on August 10, 1982, when I rose to present detailed ideas about the need to seek stability as well as reductions through arms control. In those presentations, I stressed the need to convert the ICBM forces of both sides, over time, into single warhead weapons: To de-MIRV, as the only clear answer to the growing fear of a first strike.

Many of those who lauded these ideas at the time asked whether there was any reason why the Soviets would reverse their preferences and give up large, MIRV'd ICMB's, even granting that this would be in their longer term interests. The answer was that the Soviets would not do so unless the alternative was so stark as to overcome their reluctance. Such an alternative, moreover, could only exist if the Soviets had reason to believe that we will otherwise continue our plans to deploy weapons which, in sufficient numbers, might in the future put the Soviet ICBM force at hazard.

These concepts were incorporated into the Scowcroft Commission report and I cannot help but think that had this report been delivered into the hands of some other administration, it would have consolidated opinion. But the Reagan administration lacked both credibility and credentials in arms control. In pursuit of office it campaigned vociferously against arms control as a "snare and a delusion;" in possession of office it at once dismantled the accumulated arms control skill of the Government, and took pride that its most knowledgeable officials learned their skills through years of opposing the efforts of earlier administrations of both parties.

The administration now claims to have undergone a conversion on the subject of arms control. We have asked for signs and proofs that this conversion is genuine, because it occurs in circumstances that inspire suspicion. There have been, as a result of this demand, statements and deeds that would have astonished us earlier. Many have heavily discounted these actions—perhaps too much so. In recent months, the President—having promised flexibility—has, I believe, followed through on his commitment in meaningful ways.

But we are nearly 3 years into this administration, and measures that might have once looked bold, are now inadequate. The confidence the administration has been trying to inspire will elude it, absent the appearance of an arms control position of impeccable clarity, both in purpose and in construction. The promised conversion of the Scowcroft Commission report into the specifics of a national strategy is already late. It is late because the administration, having obtained a grand plan intact, has lacked the skill and the organization to carry it out quickly.

There is something of a ferment going on in the administration. New ideas about negotiating have been under study. But much as one may admire this new zeal, what is needed, above all, is a sense of emerging order. We need to know how the administration understands basic words it has taken over, such as "modernization for stability," and "eliminating the fear of a first strike." We need to know how the MX relates to these general ideas. And we need insight as to the kinds of United States and Soviet forces that would be tolerable and, in the eyes of this administration, equitable. We need these things, because they are the basis on which an informed judgment must be made about the MX. Without them, Congress will withdraw the benefit of the doubt.

Pending analysis of this kind from the administration, we are left to our own devices. In hopes of contributing to more rapid progress, I am, therefore, offering a proposal designed to bring together as many as possible of the unassimilated elements of the problem: The disposition of SALT II; deep reductions; stability; the MX, the single warhead ICBM, and an approach to the "build-down" concept—which the administratioin has accepted as politically significant, but not yet defined.

The essence of this proposal is to design an agreement of sufficient duration to work with, rather than directly against, the normal rhythm of modernization and replacement on both sides. Obviously, the first issue that we would then have to deal with is the manner in which each side will incorporate one new type of ICBM into its inventory: The MX and SS-X-24; both MIRV'd, and of similar size. Subsequently, one would have to make adjustments for the incorporation of a second new type—a small, single warhead ICBM. Given the rate of development of these weapons, it becomes possible to imagine an agreement of about 12 years duration, divided into two phases: The first phase marking the deployment of the last of the MIRV'd ICBM's; the second phase marking the shift away from such weapons.

In the first phase of adjustment, I have applied a form of build-down principle, in which each side must tax itself if it insists on expanding the number of its MIRV'd ballistic missiles. If we insist on deploying more such warheads on land, the number of them at sea must decline. If the Soviets insist on deploying more such warheads at sea—and apparently they are determined to deploy a much more highly MIRV'd SLBM force—then the number of such weapons on land must decline. During the first phase of adjustment, launcher numbers very close to Soviet preferences might be accomodated—providing that Soviet heavy ICBM's give way to some extent, and that the SS-X-24 is used to replace larger, more highly MIRV'd ICBM's.

As a result of reductions called for in the first phase, the Soviet Union's ability to threaten U.S. silos will diminish substantially, although it will still not have given it up. The United States, because of MX, will have increased its ability to threaten Soviet silos, but will still not have the capacity to mount a disarming first strike against the Soviet missile force. Thereafter, during the second phase of adjustment, single warhead ICBM's are deployed, and as both sides complete reduction to 5,000 ballistic missile warheads each, neither side will have the means to conduct a first strike which would be to their military advantage. As a result, a shift to mobile missile launchers would be unnecessary; the missiles would remain in silos.

Eliminating a disarming first strike capability on land is hardly worthwhile if it only reappears again at sea. Potentially, the Trident II D-5 missile, which would become available during the second period of this agreement, could frustrate this objective. Over a longer period of time, the Soviets can

improve their SLBM force to the point where it too poses an effective first strike threat against U.S. silos. The most direct way to avoid this would be, as I have proposed in earlier model agreements, not to deploy new, advanced SLBM's at all. An alternative, presented here, is to limit the number of such warheads at sea to a level insufficient to comprise a disarming first strike force.

I want to emphasize that while these calculations have been done as realistically as possible, I am not advancing them as unique to definitive. What these proposals show, however, is the possibility of a comprehensive arms control approach, accommodating the deployment of the MX and the SS-X-24, but containing their effects, in the course of bringing to an end this particular chapter of nuclear weapons development. What would emerge is a plan to gradually shift the forces of both sides to dramatically lower levels, with mixes of weapons on each side that are mutually stable.

That this can be done is good news. Much better news would be the appearance of the administration's own overall conceptions.

AN INTEGRATED LONG-TERM ARMS CONTROL PROPOSAL

I. Through December 1984 the United States and the Soviet Union cannot exceed the SALT II ceilings on MIRVed ballistic missiles.

II. Throughout the lifetime of the strategic arms reduction agreement, there will be a severe restriction on the number of flight tests of complete ballistic missile systems that were deployed before calendar year 1982.

III. The United States and the Soviet Union agree to a twelve-year two-phased program for reducing the aggregate number of strategic nuclear warheads now deployed with ballistic missiles and long-range strategic bomber aircraft. Each phase will last six years, with the first phase starting in January 1985.

IV. The following assumptions apply in accounting for the reductions of ICBM and SLMB warheads: (1) All U.S. Minuteman III ICBMs carry three MIRVs, and Poseidon and Trident SLBMs carry 10 and eight MIVRs, respectively; and, (2) All Soviet SS-17, SS-19, and SS-18 ICBMs carry four, six, and 10 MIRVs, respectively.

V. During Phase I—

(1) The United States to retire at least two SLBM warheads for each ICBM warhead it has above the number of ICBM warheads estimated (in accordance to the warhead counting rule stated above) for December 1982. Regardless of any increase in the number of ICBM warheads, no less than 500 SLBM warheads to be retired during each year of Phase I [see (3) below];

(2) The Soviet Union to retire at least two ICBM warheads for each SLBM warhead it has above the number of SLBM warheads estimated (in accordance to the warhead counting rule stated above) for December 1982. The first ICBM warheads retired to be from heavy ICBMs. Regardless of any increase in the number of SLBM warheads, no less than 500 warheads from heavy ICBMs to be retired during each year of Phase I;

(3) Each nation can deploy a new type of MIRVed SLBM, provided that not more than 1,000 MIRVs are deployed on these SLBMs; however, the United States to retire one or more of its older SLBM warheads for every new SLBM warhead it deploys;

(4) Each nation can replace 100 existing MIRVed ICBMs with an equal or smaller number of MIRVed ICBMs, provided that the new MIRVed ICBM: (a) replaces the heaviest type of MIRVed ICBM now deployed, (b) has a throw weight not higher than 3,600 kilograms, and (c) does not carry more than 10 MIRVs.

(5) Each nation can aply any excess of warheads retired above the number required toward follow-on deployments of warheads; and,

(6) Each nation can have whatever number of heavy and medium-weight strategic bombers it desires, provided that the aggregate ceiling on ballistic missile warheads and bomber weapons is not exceeded.

VI. By the end of Phase I—

Each nation to have not more than:

(1) 8,500 warheads deployed in ballistic missiles and bombers;

(2) 7,500 warheads deployed in ballistic missiles; and,

(3) 4,000 warheads deployed in ICBMs.

VII. During Phase II—

Each nation to retire all but 100 of its MIRVed ICBMs. The ICBMs being retired can be replaced with new single-warhead small intercontinental ballistic missiles (SICBMs), provided that the throw weight of the SICBM is not more than 500 kilograms.

VIII. By the end of Phase II—

Each nation to have not more than:

(1) 6,500 warheads deployed in ballistic missiles and bombers;

(2) 5,000 warheads deployed in ballistic missiles;

(3) 100 MIRVed ICBMs; and,

(4) MIRVed ICBMs with more than 3,600 kilograms of throw weight.

IX. After completion of Phase II—

Each nation can:

(1) Retire ICBM warheads and replace them with an equal number of SLBM warheads;

(2) Retire MIRVed ICBMs and replace each warhead with a single-warhead SICBM deployed in a new silo; and,

(3) Replace ICBMs and SLBMs with new models of the same class.

X. General Provisions—

Neither nation can:

(1) Deploy sea-launched cruise missiles (SLCMs) in SSBNs or other types of nuclear-powered submarines; and,

(2) Encrypt the data telemetered during tests of ballistic missiles.

RESULTS OF THE PROPOSAL

Table I and Table II show the estimated number of strategic nuclear delivery systems (ICBMs, SLBMs, and bomber aircraft) and warheads the United States and the Soviet Union had at the end of December 1982. Each table shows illustrative inventories of strategic weapons the U.S. and Soviet Union could have under this proposal. The total number of ICBM warheads credited to the Soviets for December 1982 are higher than official U.S. estimates because (following the SALT II rule "once MIRVed, all MIRVed") all the SS-17, SS-18, and SS-19 ICBMs are counted as MIRVed ICBMs.

To the United States

Some of the consequences to the U.S. in adopting this proposal are:

During Phase I

(1) After all the Titan II ICBMs are retired and 100 Minuteman III missiles are replaced with 100 MX ICBMs, the inventory of ICBM warheads would rise by 651 warheads (2,800−2,149=651). Although the U.S. would not reach the proposed 4,000-warhead ceiling on ICBMs, the ratio of Soviet hard-target-capable ICBM warheads to U.S. ICBM silos also would be significantly reduced—from more than 5.0 in December 1982 to about 3.6 at the end of Phase I. Conversely, the ration of U.S. hard-target-capable ICBM warheads to Soviet ICBM silos would be improved from about 0.64 in December 1982 to approximately 1.98 at the end of Phrase I.

(2) The additional 651 ICBM warheads would require a reduction of at least 1,302 SLBM warheads.

(3) The deployment of 2,112 RVs in 11 Ohio-class SSBNs must be offset by retiring an equal or larger number of older SLBM warheads. Therefore, 224 Poseidon SLBMs (2,240 RVs) in 10 Lafayett-class boats, and 144 Trident I SLBMs (1,152 RVs) in nine Lafayette-class boats would have to be retired (1,302+2,112=3,414>3,392=2,240+1,152).

(4) By the end of Phase I the United States would be under the proposed 7,500-warhead ceiling on ballistic missiles.

(5) To reach the proposed overall warhead limit for Phase I (8,500), the U.S. must reduce its inventory by 1,075 warheads. The U.S. would continue to have substantial numbers of strategic warheads deployed in bomber aircraft, but the current deployment plan for air-launched cruise missiles (ALCMs) would be cut back to 1,188 deployed externally on only 99 B-52 bombers. B-1B bombers would initially carry only internally-mounted bombs and short-range attack missiles (SRAMs).

During Phase II

(1) The U.S. would replace the remaining 450 Minuteman III ICBMs with a like number of single-warhead SICBMs, deploying them in vacated Minuteman III silos. Also, 164 Minuteman II ICBMs would be retired to retain a larger number of SLBM warheads.

(2) Five more Ohio-class boats (for a total of 17) would be deployed, and all remaining Lafayette-class SSBNs (12) would be retired.

(3) By the end of Phase II the U.S. would be at the proposed overall ceiling of 6,500 warheads for ballistic missiles and bombers. The survivability of the silo-based ICBMs would be improved because the ratio of Soviet hard-target-capable ICBM warheads to U.S. ICBM silos would be approximately 1.8. The ratio of U.S. hard-target-capable ICBM warheads to Soviet ICBM silos would be about 1.5. The B-1B bomber force would be transitioning from a penetration role to a stand-off role armed with ALCMs. The remaining B-52s and FB-111s eventually would be replaced by "Stealth" Advanced Technology Bombers (ATBs).

Post Phase II

(1) The ICBM force would consist of 100 M-X missiles and a mix of new (450 SICBMs) and older single-warhead ICBMs (286 Minuteman IIs) deployed in silos.

(2) The SSBN fleet would consist of 17 Ohio-class boats equipped with a total of 408 SLBMs (12 boats equipped with Trident Is and five boats equipped with Trident IIs).

(3) The bomber force would consist of 50 "Stealth" ATBs (replacing FB-111s) and 100 B-1Bs equipped with externally-mounted ALCMs.

To the Soviet Union

Some of the consequences to the Soviet Union is adopting this proposal are:

During Phase I

(1) Following the build-down formula to retire two ICBM warheads for each additional SLBM warhead that is deployed, it is projected that the Soviet Union would have to retire 2,092 ICBM warheads (2,080 from 208 SS-18 ICBMs and 12 from other ICBMs) if it deploys four more Typhoon SSBNs and six additional Delta III SSBNs, and retires 19 Yankee I, one Golf III, one Yankee II, and seven Hotel II/III boats (3,500 SLBM RVs at the end of Phase I minus 2,454 SLBM RVs in December 1982 = 1,046 RVs; and 1,046 x 2 = 2,092).

(2) The remaining 100 SS-18 heavy ICBMs would have to be replaced with a new but lighter MIRVed ICBM, if the Soviets want to retain as many MIRVed ICBMs as possible during Phase I.

(3) In addition to the 2,092 ICBM warheads retired to balance the projected increase in SLBM warheads, the Soviets would have to retire 178 more ICBM warheads to reach the proposed 4,000-warhead ceiling for ICBMs (6,270 RVs in December 1982 − 4,000 RV ceiling − 2,092 RVs = 178 RVs). The Soviets would probably want to retain as many MIRVed ICBMs as possible and choose to retire the 178 additional warheads from older single-warhead ICBMs. If they choose to retire warheads from MIRVed ICBMs instead, they would be able to retain a larger number of ICBMs during Phase I.

(4) By the end of Phase I the Soviet Union would be at the proposed warhead ceiling on ballistic missiles—a reduction of 1,224 RVs. It also would be at the proposed total warhead ceiling after deploying some additional bomber aircraft. It is postulated that additional Backfire bombers would be deployed, and that Bear and Bison aircraft would be replaced with ALCM-equipped Blackjack heavy bombers.

During Phase II

(1) The Soviet Union would retire the remaining 110 SS-17 and 362 SS-19 ICBMs, and deploy a like number of single-warhead SICBMs in the vacated silos.

(2) The remaining Yankee I-class SSBNs would be retired to reach the proposed 5,000-warhead ceiling on ballistic missiles.

(3) By the end of Phase II the Soviet Union would attain the proposed total warhead ceiling. All the Bear and Bison bombers would have been replaced with Backfire and Blackjack bombers.

Post Phase II

(1) The ICBM force would consist of 100 SS-24 MIRVed ICBMs and a mix of new (472 SICBMs) and older single-warhead ICBMs (388 SS-11 missiles) deployed in silos. The ratio of SICBMs to SS-11s could vary, however, depending on whether MIRVed ICBMs or additional SS-11s were retired during Phase I.

(2) The SSBN fleet would probably consist of five Typhoon-class boats equipped with a total of 100 SS-N-20 SLBMs, and 20 Delta III-class boats equipped with a total of 320 SS-N-18 SLBMs.

(3) The bomber force would probably consist of 150 Backfire bombers equipped with bombs or SRAMs, and 100 Blackjack bombers carrying externally-mounted ALCMs.

Verification issues

Verification could be carried out as follows:

(1) National Technical Means (NTM) already in place can observe the number and types of ICBMs and SLBMs deployed. Overhead reconnaissance provides information on new deployments and retirements of ICBMs. The sea trials of new SSBNs and the retirement or conversion of older ballistic missile-launching submarines is now routinely detected by NTM.

(2) The task of estimating the number of warheads deployed in SS-17, SS-18, and SS-19 ICBMs would be simplified. All of these missiles would be assumed to carry the maximum number of warheads allowed under SALT II.

(3) Rules and procedures for dismantling and scrapping excess systems have already been established under SALT II.

(4) The hard-target capabilities of missiles currently in the arsenals are already established, providing a data base for both sides.

(5) The counting rules for bomber-deliverable weapons has not been established; however, functionally related observable differences (FRODs) for bombers armed with ALCMs have been adopted under SALT II. Individual bomber aircraft could be required not to possess a concurrent capability to carry internally and externally-mounted nuclear weapons.

TABLE I.—ESTIMATED AND PROJECTED U.S. STRATEGIC WEAPONS INVENTORIES

Estimated—December 1982	Projected—End of phase I	Projected—End of phase II	Projected—Post phase II
550 Minuteman III×3=1,650 RVs	550 Minuteman III×3=1,650 RVs	450 Minuteman III×3=1,350 RVs	Retired
	−100 Minuteman III×3=−300 RVs	−450 Minuteman III×3=−1,350 RVs	
		+450 SICBM×1=+450 RVs	450 SICBM×1=450 RVs
	+100 M-X×10=+1,000 RVs	100 M-X×10=1,000 RVs	100 M-X×10=1,000 RVs
450 Minuteman II×1=450 RVs	450 Minuteman II×1=450 RVs	450 Minuteman II×1=450 RVs	286 Minuteman II×1=286 RVs
		−164 Minuteman II×1=−164 RVs	
49 Titan II×1=49 RVs	49 Titan II×1=49 RVs	Retired	
	−49 Titan II×1=−49 RVs		
1,049 ICBMs: 2,149 RVs	1,000 ICBMs: 2,800 RVs	836 ICBMs: 1,736 RVs	836 ICBMs: 1,736 RVs
176 Trident I×8=1,408 RVs	176 Trident I×8=1,408 RVs	48 Trident I×8=384 RVs	Retired
(11 Lafayette SSBNs)	(11 Lafayette SSBNs)	(3 Lafayette SSBNs)	
	+16 Trident I×8=128 RVs	−48 Trident I×8=384 RVs	
	(+1 Lafayette SSBN)	(−3 Lafayette SSBNs)	
	−144 Trident I×8=−1,152 RVs		
	(−9 Lafayette SSBNs)		
320 Poseidon×10=3,200 RVs	320 Poseidon×10=3,200 RVs	144 Poseidon×10=1,440 RVs	Retired
(20 Lafayette SSBNs)	(20 Lafayette SSBNs)	(9 Lafayette SSBNs)	
	−16 Poseidon×10=−160 RVs	−144 Poseidon×10=−1,440 RVs	
	(−1 Lafayette SSBN)	(−9 Lafayette SSBNs)	
	−224 Poseidon×10=−2,240 RVs		
	(−10 Lafayette SSBNs)		
24 Trident I×8=192 RVs	24 Trident I×8=192 RVs	288 Trident I×8=2,304 RVs	288 Trident I×8=2,304 RVs
(1 Ohio SSBN)	(1 Ohio SSBN)	(12 Ohio SSBNs)	(12 Ohio SSBNs)
	+264 Trident I×8=+2,112 RVs	+120 Trident II×8=+960 RVs	120 Trident II×8=960 RVs
	(+11 Ohio SSBNs)	(+5 Ohio SSBNs)	5 Ohio SSBNs)
520 SLBMs: 4,800 RVs	416 SLBMs: 3,488 RVs	408 SLBMs: 3,264 RVs	408 SLBMs: 3,264 RVs
1,569 Missiles: 6,949 RVs	1,416 Missiles: 6,288 RVs	1,244 Missiles: 5,000 RVs	1,244 Missiles: 5,000 RVs
272 B-52×various=2,402 WHs	99 B-52×12=1,188 WHs	10 B-52×12=120 WHs	Retired
56 FB-111×4=224 WHs	56 FB-111×4=224 WHs	50 FB-111×4=200 WHs	Retired
	100 B-1B×8=800 WHs	5 B-1B×8=40 WHs	100 B-1B×12=1,200 WHs
	95 B-1B×12=1,140 WHs	50 Stealth×6=300 WHs	
328 Bombers: 2,626 WHs	255 Bombers: 2,212 WHs	195 Bombers: 1,500 WHs	150 Bombers: 1,500 WHs
Total warheads=9,575	Total warheads=8,500	Total warheads=6,500	Total warheads=6,500

TABLE II.—ESTIMATED AND PROJECTED SOVIET STRATEGIC WEAPONS INVENTORIES

Estimated—December 1982	Projected—End of phase I	Projected—End of phase II	Projected—Post phase II
308 SS-18×10=3,080 RVs	308 SS-18×10=3,080 RVs	Retired	
	−208 SS-18×10=−2,080 RVs		
	−100 SS-18×10=−1,000 RVs		
	+100 SS-24×10=+1,000 RVs	100 SS-24×10=1,000 RVs	100 SS-24×10=1,000 RVs
330 SS-19×6=1,980 RVs	330 SS-19×6=1,980 RVs	362 SS-19×6=2,172 RVs	Retired
	+32 SS-19×6=+192 RVs	−362 SS-19×6=−2,172 RVs	
		+362 SICBMs×1=362 RVs	362 SICBMs×1=362 RVs
150 SS-17×4=600 RVs	150 SS-17×4=600 RVs	110 SS-17×4=440 RVs	Retired
	−40 SS-17×4=−160 RVs	−110 SS-17×4=−440 RVs	
		+110 SICBMs×1=+110 RVs	110 SICBMs×1=110 RVs
550 SS-11×1=550 RVs	550 SS-11×1=550 RVs	388 SS-11×1=388 RVs	388 SS-11×1=388 RVs
	−32 SS-11×1=−32 RVs		

TABLE II.—ESTIMATED AND PROJECTED SOVIET STRATEGIC WEAPONS INVENTORIES—Continued

Estimated—December 1982	Projected—End of phase I	Projected—End of phase II	Projected—Post phase II
	−130 SS-11×1=−130 RVs		
60 SS-13×1=60 RVs	60 SS-13×1=60 RVs	Retired	
	−60 SS-13×1=−60 RVs		
1,398 ICBMs: 6,270 RVs	960 ICBMs: 4,000 RVs	960 ICBMs: 1,860 RVs	960 ICBMs: 1,860 RVs
20 SS-N-20×9=180 RVs	20 SS-N-20×9=180 RVs	100 SS-N-20×9=900 RVs	100 SS-N-20×9=900 RVs
(1 Typhoon SSBN)	(1 Typhoon SSBN)	(5 Typhoon SSBNs)	(5 Typhoon SSBNs)
	+80 SS-N-20×9=+720 RVs		
	(+4 Typhoon SSBNs)		
224 SS-N-18×7=1,568 RVs	224 SS-N-18×7=1,568 RVs	320 SS-N-18×7=2,240 RVs	320 SS-N-18×7=2,240 RVs
(14 Delta III SSBNs)	(14 Delta III SSBNs)	(20 Delta III SSBNs)	(20 Delta III SSBNs)
	+96 SS-N-18×7=+672 RVs		
	(+6 Delta III SSBNs)		
64 SS-N-8×1=64 RVs	64 SS-N-8×1=64 RVs	Retired	
(4 Delta II SSBNs)	4 Delta II SSBNs)		
216 SS-N-8×1=216 RVs	216 SS-N-8×1=216 RVs	Retired	
(18 Delta I SSBNs)	(18 Delta I SSBNs)		
6 SS-N-8×1=6 RVs	Retired		
(1 Hotel III SSBN)			
18 SS-N-8×1=18 RVs	Retired		
(6 Hotel II SSBNs)			
6 SS-N-8×1=6 RVs	Retired		
(1 Golf III SSB)			
384 SS-N-6×1=384 RVs	384 SS-N-6×1=384 RVs	80 SS-N-6×1=80 RVs	Retired
(24 Yankee I SSBNs)	(24 Yankee I SSBNs)	(5 Yankee I SSBNs)	
	−304 SS-N-6×1=−304 RVs	−80 SS-N-6×1=−80 RVs	
	(−19 Yankee I SSBNs)	(−5 Yankee I SSBNs)	
12 SS-N-17×1=12 RVs	Retired		
(1 Yankee II SSBN)			
950 SLBMs: 2,454 RVs	780 SLBMs: 3,500 RVs	420 SLBMs: 3,140 RVS	420 SLBMs: 3,140 RVs
2,348 Missiles: 8,724 RVs	1,740 Missiles: 7,500 RVs	1,380 Missiles: 5,000 RVs	1,380 Missiles: 5,000 RVs
100 Tu-95 Bear×1=100 WHS	100 Tu-95 Bear×1=100 WHs	Retired	
45 Mya-4 Bison×1=45 WHs	Retired		
100 Tu-26 Backfire×2=200 WHs	150 Tu-26 Backfire×2=300 WHs	150 Tu-26 Backfire×2=300 WHs	150 Tu-26 Backfire×2=300 WHs
	50 Blackjack×12=600 WHs	100 Blackjack×12=1,200 WHs	100 Blackjack×12=1,200 WHs
255 Bombers: 345 WHs	300 Bombers: 1,000 WHs	250 Bombers: 1,500 WHs	250 Bombers: 1,500 WHs
Total warheads=9,069	Total warheads=8,500	Total warheads=6,500	Total warheads=6,500

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the administration, it is my privilege to introduce a bill to authorize a new concept of care and economy for the Federal employees health benefits program (FEHBP)—the voucher. I urge early and comprehensive hearings on this important initiative and trust that my colleagues will give this proposal serious consideration.

The voucher is an expansion of, not a departure from, the current FEHBP which features multiple choice of health plans and fixed-dollar subsidies. However, the choice could be greater, the cost more predictable, and the cost-reducing incentives more effective.

While there are more than 130 plans in the FEHBP, the average Federal worker has access to an average of only 12 plans. Only 5 plans offer both low- and high-option coverage. Only the 2 Government-wide plans and 7 of the 11 employee organization plans open to all Government employees accepted retired workers in 1982. Choice is limited for active and retired Federal workers under the current program.

This voucher proposal would permit any State-licensed plan, subject to Federal financial soundness criteria, to participate. All plan records would be open to inspection by the Office of Personnel Management and the General Accounting Office. The OPM would specify minimum catastrophic coverage for all plans.

The unpredictibility of Government costs and the Government's underpricing of premiums in 1979 and 1980 led to the chaos in 1981 which required that benefits be cut, premiums be raised and that open season be delayed. Currently, the Government contribution is driven by the so-called Big Six plans. The amount the Government pays to any plan is 60 percent of the unweighted average of the Big Six rates, not to exceed 75 percent of an individual plan's rate. OPM negotitates with carriers over both rates and benefits.

Under this voucher plan, the payment would be tied to the average of all (not low options as some reported) self and self and family premiums paid in 1984 and indexed to the GNP deflator. OPM would not longer negotiate premiums and benefits. The voucher plan would require the Postal Service and District of Columbia as off-budget agencies to pay the employer's share of retirees' premiums. The general Treasury now pays that share.

The 75-percent cap biases plans against offering lower option coverage. As a result of the cap, the Government pays a larger dollar amount for high-cost plans. This creates a disincentive to enroll in and thus to offer lower-cost plans. This deters competition among carriers for lower-cost coverage. This leads to higher Government and employee contributions.

The voucher would pay 100 percent of the indexed 1984 average premium. If a plan cost less, the difference (up to a certain amount) would be rebated to the employee. If the employee desired greater coverage, he or she would pay the difference out of pocket. Under this bill, the voucher program would become effective October 1, 1984.

The voucher plan is dedicated to the proposition that you can cut costs without cutting the quality of care or people's access to it. Some believe the voucher may lead to reduced benefits, loss of cost control over carriers, and unacceptable costs for those employees, active or retired, with greater medical need. In short, some believe that medical need is inelastic, that most people are risk averse, and that premiums and benefits should be regulated by the Government. In that view, the job of government is to preserve a maximum benefit structure.

It is my view that opposition to the voucher is premature, based upon a one-sided reading of the 1959 Act, and the result of misconceptions about medical care and need.

We should give the voucher concept a chance in legislative proceedings. I have questions (discussed later) and convictions about its potential. Let us have a thorough review of a concept that may be constructively applied to the exploding costs of the medicare program.

Clearly, the act calls for the Government (that is OPM) to negotiate rates and benefits to achieve a package comparable to larger employers and progressive industry. The goal is to "assure maximum health benefits at the lowest possible cost to (employees)

and to the Government" (House Report 86-958, page 4). The purpose is to provide for competitive recruitment and retention of competent personnel.

According to a 1983 GAO report (HRD-83-21) And the 1982 Mercer report, the FEHBP falls somewhat short of what the private sector offers in benefits and pays as employers.

The remedy urged by some is to mandate benefits in law (none are specified now), to add new beneficiaries, and for Government to spend more. This is the approach taken in H.R. 656 which the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits is now considering.

How should we reach private sector comparability? It is my view that the answer to comparability is to permit more competition rather than to increase regulation. Indeed, I would note that many Federal labor representatives opposed the provision in H.R. 656 that would mandate certain benefits under law. With respect to Government contributions, James J. LaPenta, Jr., director of the Mail Handlers Health Benefit plan made an interesting point in his subcommittee testimony:

> I recognize that Congress has not only an obligation to Federal and postal employees, but also an obligation to the taxpayers to keep total program costs within reasonable and manageable limits. Furthermore, because the Federal contribution is based on an average of the annually changing premium levels of the Big Six plans, the total Federal cost is variable and unpredictable. This lack of predictability can lead, as it did in 1981, to last-minute crises and arbitrary and unfair * * * cuts * * * (We) would support a measure placing a limit on the amount by which the Government contribution could increase in any given year. That limit, however, should not arbitrarily tie the Government's contribution to some standard unrelated to costs in the program.

It is my view that we can only achieve a balance between maximum benefits and acceptable costs through a marketplace mechanism such as a voucher. The choice is between more regulation or more competition. The debate is over the control of benefits rather than the level of benefits. The alternative to a consumer-choice system is a provider-dominated system. The act calls for comparability to progressive industry. Let us be sure that our legislative remedies are progressive.

The fear that a voucher abandons the consumers and cost control is based on misconceptions about medical care. The chief misconception is that more services—more care—better health. In an excellent little book (on another alternative health care financing system) called "Health Plan," Dr. Alain C. Enthoven of Stanford University debunks these and other misconceptions about medical care. He states:

> * * * a financing system that motivates giving more rather than less care is not necessarily leading doctors to give better care or to produce better health.

The result of adopting a static view of medical need and care is a call for public utility regulation and resistance to financial incentives.

The voucher would force carriers to examine and control provider costs if they want to keep enrollees who receive a fixed-dollar subsidy. The voucher puts the heat on carriers and providers, not the consumer.

This is not a black and white issue. We are talking about the grey areas of more regulation versus more competition. It is my view that the administration's proposal is a good starting point for discussion but not the last word. Below are some of my concerns.

Should the proposal address the potential for abusive marketing practices by new carriers?

Should the law require all plans to accept retirees in order to provide fair competition?

Does the proposal permit plans to use preexisting medical conditions as a limitation on benefits?

Should OPM require all plans to quote premiums for at least one standard package of benefits in order to facilitate comparison?

Should the voucher pay more for the old than the young? Should voucher payments be linked to categories of enrollees' risk level, in order to reduce adverse selection?

Is the GNP deflator a reasonable index? Should another index be used?

Should the voucher program provide that enrollees will be held harmless from plans that go bankrupt?

I favor a workable system of fair competition intended to make affordable health insurance available to Federal employees. The choice is how we get there—through more regulation or more competition.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I request that a summary of the bill be included.

SUMMARY

A bill to restructure the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program to strengthen financial control over the Program and enhance competition among participating health plans, and for other purposes

The FEHB Program needs major reform to set it on a firm course for the future, so that the interests of enrollees and the Government are protected. This bill is designed to preserve the best features of the current Program while solving the problems.

SECTION 1

This act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Health Benefits Reform Act of 1983."

SECTION 2

Subsection 2(a) of the bill would revise and reenact the current Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) law (5 U.S.C., ch. 89) as follows:

Section 8901—Definitions

The definitions in the current section 8901 would be essentially reenacted with the notable exception of "carrier." The new definition would broaden health plan participation to include (A) Government-wide, regional, or local plans offered by one or more Blue Cross and Blue Shield corporations or by any legal entity licensed to market group health insurance in the State in which the plan is offered; (B) additional employee organization-sponsored plans; and (C) all Federally qualified health maintenance organizations (HMO's).

Section 8902—Qualified health benefits plans

The law would no longer authorize OPM to contract with carriers for FEHB plans. Eligible carriers would be required to submit proposed plans for OPM approval which would be accorded if the carrier certifies that group insurance benefits will be offered to all eligible FEHB participants: (1) at rates consistent with the carrier's lowest schedule of rates for comparable polices; (2) in accordance with minimum catastrophic protection requirements specified by OPM regulations; and (3) with acceptable conversion rights upon involuntary termination of group eligibility. Reinsurance requirements would ensure the financial stability of plans.

This section also requires carriers to provide enrollees with a detailed plan description in a format approved by OPM, to grant OPM and GAO access to plan records, and to have in place a satisfactory utilization review system.

Section 8903—Enrollment procedures

This section essentially reenacts current provisions of law.

Each employing office and retirement system would be required to issue to their eligible employees and annuitants such materials as OPM may prescribe for purposes of facilitating a choice among available health benefits plans, including: a list of plans and their respective premium rates, instructions for obtaining detailed information on benefits from carriers, and a health care voucher form on which to register a choice of plan. OPM would see to it that comparative information on plans is made available to enrollees.

Section 8904—Government contributions and enrollee premiums

The most important correction needed is in calculating the Government contribution to health benefits premiums. The current formula which ties that contribution to the average premium for the highest level of benefits offered by six of the plans with the largest FEHB enrollments is too unpredictable. The proposal would replace this formula with specified contribution rates which would be amounts equal to the average Government contribution rate in the preceding plan year for self-only and self-and-family enrollments, respectively, indexed in accordance with the percentage change in the implicit price deflator for the Gross National Product over the 12-month period ending March 31 preceding each plan year, as determined by OPM based on GNP calculations published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Another change would be to eliminate the current 75 percent limitation on the Government contribution toward the cost of a particular plan or level of benefits in order to encourage enrollees to select lower cost plans, possibly at no enrollee cost. More-

over, if an enrollee elects a health plan with a premium cost below the available Government contribution, the enrollee would be entitled to receive a cash rebate equal to the amount of any excess Government contributions, except that such rebate may not exceed 40 percent of the authorized Government contribution in each use. Health plan premiums in excess of the basic Government contribution would be withheld from the enrollee's pay or annuity.

In addition to the basic Government contribution, Government agencies would contribute an amount for each enrollment, as determined necessary by OPM but not to exceed one percent of the basic Government premium contribution rate, to fund OPM's administration of the law. Expenditures for administrative expenses would be subject to limitations imposed each year by Congress. OPM would continue to receive all Government contributions and enrollee withholdings and to forward appropriate payments to participating health plans.

The proposal would further improve Program financing by requiring the Postal Service and the District of Columbia government to assume responsibility for payment of Government contributions on behalf of their retired employees, or their survivors, as well as requiring the Department of Labor to make contributions on behalf of recipients of workers' compensation benefits and charge such amounts back to the former employing agency.

Section 8905—Coverage of reinstated employees and restored annuitants

This section essentially reenacts 5 U.S.C. 8908.

§ 8906. Employees Health Benefits Fund

In addition to the existing administrative reserve, an enrollees' contingency reserve account would be established in the Fund, to which OPM may credit any amounts which accrue to the general Fund in excess of premium payments due carriers and, pursuant to section 3 of the bill, any balance remaining in existing health plan contingency reserve accounts in the Fund at the end of two years after termination of final contracts entered into under current provisions of 5 U.S.C. 8902. The newly created reserve would be available, without fiscal year limitation, for payment of expenses which OPM deems proper for the benefit of FEHB enrollees.

Section 8907.—Studies and reports

This section essentially reenacts 5 U.S.C. 8910.

Section 8908.—Jurisdiction of courts

This section essentially reenacts 5 U.S.C. 8912.

Section 8909.—Regulations

This section substantially reenacts 5 U.S.C. 8913.

Section 2(b) of the bill would make the amendments to chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, effective with respect to health plan enrollments and Government contributions on and after October 1, 1984. To ensure that the new provisions will be fully implemented on the specified effective date, the bill would authorize OPM to automatically assign current FEHB enrollees who do not specify a choice with respect to health plan coverage under the new program to an appropriate successor health plan. Also, section 2(b) would permit currently operating FEHB plans to continue under the new program without meeting the new reinsurance requirements, provided they are financially stable.

SECTION 3

Section 3(a) would amend existing FEHB law to provide that all contracts which become effective in January 1984 shall terminate effective September 30, 1984.

Section 3(b) would provide that any balance in health plan contingency reserve accounts in the Employees Health Benefits Fund shall be transferred to the enrollees' contingency reserve account established under section 8906(c) of title 5, United States Code, as amended by section 2 of this bill, effective October 1, 1986.

Section 3(c) would provide that the administrative reserve account in the Employees Health Benefits Fund immediately prior to the effective date of section 2 of this bill shall be available without limitation to meet OPM's expenses for implementation of this law.

SECTION 4

The retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act would be amended to abolish the Government-wide Uniform Plan, effective December 31, 1983. Then, effective January 1, 1984, any remaining Uniform Plan enrollees would be automatically transferred to an appropriate level of benefits under the Government-wide Indemnity Benefit Plan under the FEHB Program.●

THE RIDE

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a most worthwhile effort to meet the transportation needs of the physically disabled in three of the communities I represent.

The barriers which confront handicapped people should be a constant concern for all Americans. Those without disabilities too often forget the difficulties faced by the handicapped. Fortunately, the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) understands this problem and has taken a significant step toward countering the physical barriers which confront disabled people in their daily activities.

On August 8 the MBTA will begin "The Ride" program in the communities of Everett, Chelsea and Winthrop. "The Ride" is a door-to-door transportation system for individuals who are physically disabled and prevented from using public transportation.

"The Ride" is the first disabled transportation service in the suburbs of Boston. This program has already been established and has been very successful in that city and the cities of Cambridge and Brookline.

The program's wheelchair-equipped van will run 7 days a week with a fare of only 75 cents, making it much easier for handicapped citizens to travel about their communities.

Unfortunately, we have seen the Reagan administration pursue sharp reductions in Federal services and programs for the handicapped, shifting a greater share of the responsibilities to the cities and the States. I am proud to say that my home State, and in particular the MBTA, has taken an active role in the efforts to meet the needs of the physically disabled.

"The Ride" should serve as an example for State, Federal, and local governments throughout our Nation.

I commend the MBTA and in particular General Manager James O'Leary and Massachusetts Governor Michael Dukakis for continuing this worthwhile program, and on behalf of the people of Everett, Chelsea, and Winthrop, I welcome "The Ride."●

KEY VOTES

HON. DONALD J. PEASE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, it has become my practice to periodically insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of key votes that I have cast in the U.S. House of Representatives.

The list is arranged in this manner: Each item begins with the number of the bill or resolution that the House was considering and is followed by a summary of the vote. This is followed by my own vote on the issue, whether the matter passed or failed, and the vote outcome.

This list of votes covers the period of January 3, 1983 to May 26, 1983.

(5) H. Res. 5. Rules of the House. Vote to reject an effort to change a new rule allowing the Committee of the Whole House to "rise" before consideration of each legislative rider to an appropriations bill. No. Defeated 156-250.

(10) H.R. 999. Suspension of the rules to pass a bill establishing an American Conservation Corps, which would provide grants to various federal agencies, state governments, and Indian tribes to hire youth for summer and year-round employment. Yes. Passed 301-87.

(12) H.R. 1310. Amendment would have deleted $20 million for national teaching scholarships and instead provided $50 million for a Presidential Mathematics and Science Education Fund. No. Failed 92-323.

(14) H.R. 1310. Bill authorized $325 million to improve math and science education and $100 million to promote the training and use of scientific and technical personnel. Yes. Passed 348-54.

(18) H.R. 1718. An amendment to the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for fiscal year 1983 requiring that 75 percent of the money for discretionary programs in the bill be targetted to areas of high unemployment. Yes. Passed 335-83.

(20) H.R. 1718. Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for fiscal year 1983. The bill appropriated $4.9 billion in additional funds for programs intended to create jobs and $5.3 billion for advances to the Federal Unemployment Trust Fund. Yes. Passed 324-95.

(21) H.R. 1296. Payment-in-kind Tax Treatment Act of 1983. Suspension of the

rules to permit farmers to defer income tax payment on commodities received under the Agriculture Department's 1983 payment-in-kind (PIK) program until those commodities are sold. Yes. Passed 401-1.

(22) H.R. 1900. Amendment raising the normal Social Security retirement age by 2 years to be phased in by 2027. Retirement at age 62 would still be possible, but at a lower percentage of full benefits than provided currently. No Passed 228-208.

(26) H.R. 1900. Final passage of comprehensive Social Security Act amendments, enacting various changes in the Social Security system designed to ensure its solvency. Yes. Passed 282-148.

(38) H.R. 1149. Bill designating as wilderness 30 areas of national forest and public lands in Oregon totaling 1.1 million acres, and setting aside an additional 98,000 acres for further wilderness study. Yes. Passed 252-93.

(41) H. Con. Res. 91. Rule for consideration of the First Concurrent Budget Resolution. Provided for major substitute to be offered on behalf of the President. Yes. Passed 230-187.

(46) H. Con. Res. 91. First Budget Resolution for fiscal year 1984 setting targets of $936.6 billion in budget authority, $836.6 billion in outlays, $689.1 billion in revenues, and allowing for a deficit of $174.5 billion. Yes. Passed 229-196.

(51) H.R. 1437. California Wilderness Act. Bill added 2.3 million acres in 58 areas of California to the national wilderness system, set aside 72,000 acres for further wilderness study, added 17,000 acres to the national park system, and designated 1.4 million acres of national park land as national park wilderness. Yes. Passed 297-96.

(79) H.R. 1190. Emergency Agricultural Credit Act. Bill temporarily liberalized Farmers Home Administration loans and repayment schedules to reflect the current adverse farm situation. Yes. Passed 378-5.

(89) H.J. Res. 13. (Nuclear Weapons Freeze, round II.) Passage of bill calling for a mutual and verifiable nuclear freeze on weapons in U.S. and Soviet arsenals. Yes. Passed 278-149.

(92) H.R. 2174. Federal Anti-Tampering Act. The bill made it a federal crime to knowingly tamper with a product designed to be ingested or consumed if such tampering were in reckless disregard for the risk of death or injury to the purchaser of the product. Yes. Passed 292-0.

(102) H.R. 1983. Amendment to the Emergency Housing Assistant Act which would have deleted $760 million to assist homeowners facing foreclosure on home mortgage loans. No. Failed 197-220.

(106) H.R. 1983. Emergency Housing Assistance Act. The bill established a revolving loan fund to assist homeowners who are facing foreclosure on home mortgage loans not insured by the FHA or FmHA and provided assistance for shelter and essential services for the homeless. Yes. Passed 216-196.

(109) H.R. 2066. Amendment to the National Science Authorization that would have cut the authorization for research instrumentation by $50 million. No. Failed 150-257.

(111) H.R. 2066. Bill authorizing $1.34 billion for the National Science Foundation Authorization for fiscal year 1984. Yes. Passed 297-111.

(112) H.R. 2587. Amendment to Energy Department Civilian R&D Authorization for fiscal year 1984 prohibiting the use of funds in fiscal year 1984 to either continue or terminate the Clinch River Breeder Reactor project unless Congress subsequently enacts cost-sharing legislation. Yes. Passed 388-1.

(114) H.R. 2587. Amendment to the Energy Department Civilian R&D Authorization for 1984 that would have reduced overall funding by approximately $310 million. No. Failed 140-228.

(116) H.R. 2587. Energy Department Civilian Research and Development Authorization of $3.3 billion for fiscal year 1984. Yes. Passed 230-132.

(123) H.R. 2973. Suspension of rules to repeal Tax Withholding on Interest and Dividend Income. The bill repealed the provisions of the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-248). Yes. Passed 382-41.

(129) H.R. 2990. Rule on the Increase in Public Debt Limit which barred all amendments other than committee amendment. Yes. Passed 263-156.

(132) H.R. 2948. Suspension of the rules to pass Veterans' Housing Benefits Amendments. The bill provided up to $8,400 in loans to veterans facing foreclosure on home mortgages guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. Yes. Passed 394-23.

(138) H.R. 3069. Amendment to spend $49 million to restore the West Front of the Capital Building instead of the $70.5 million provided in the bill to extend the West Front. Yes. Passed 325-86.

(139) H.R. 3069. Bill appropriated $4.8 billion in Supplemental Budget Authority for fiscal year 1983. The bill also delays implementation of merit pay and promotion rules for federal employees, and limits the amount of honoraria a Member of Congress may receive to no more than 30 percent of congressional salary. Yes. Passed 309-92.

(141) S. Con. Res. 26. Resolution releasing approximately $625 million in fiscal year 1983 funds for MX missile basing mode activities and test flights. No. Passed 223-167.

(142) H. Res. 177. Resolution rejecting the Administration's proposed deferral of $3 million for the development of energy efficient consumer products and $1.5 million for the National Appropriate Technology Assistance Service (NATAS). Yes. Passed 280-107.●

THE ACID RAIN DEBATE

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, acid rain will be one of the key congressional debates of the fall. The discussion and resulting decisions will indicate a tremendous amount about our ability to deal rationally and realistically with this complex and important issue.

Without at this time trying to prescribe any solutions, I would like to state some principles I believe are important to reaching a sound decision. They are principles I plan to discuss with constituents in the 12th Congressional District at office hours and meetings over the coming weeks.

First, we must realize that acid rain is a very serious problem and must be dealt with effectively. While doubt remained in recent years about the severity of the issue, recent reports clearly show the need for decisions.

Second, those reports also show we do not have the necessary scientific understanding of the phenomena involved in acid rain to be sure that any strategy we choose is the optimum strategy. It is more likely we will be basing strategy on the best current "educated guesses" concerning the problem, and that calls for caution.

Third, coming from one of the largest coal producing areas in the United States, it is clear to me that while coal supporters must admit the severity of the problem, we must also resist efforts to place all the blame on coal. A consensus appears to be evolving within the scientific community that seems to say that acid rain in the Northeast is largely caused by emissions of SO_2 and NO_x from powerplants, industrial boilers, automobiles, and trucks. A solution must include coal, but a policy that centers only on coal will not only be unfair, but will not solve the problem.

Fourth, we must not lose total sight of other national goals. Possibly, the most environmentally sound energy source presently available is importing oil that is pumped somewhere else in the world; but in the years ahead we face more energy shortages, and failing to make full use of the coal we have is folly for our energy security and ridiculous for our economy that needs mining jobs and the energy self-sufficiency enhanced by coal use.

Fifth, scientific understanding remains uncertain about the impact of reductions. Even if we agreed on a 50-percent reduction in SO2 emissions, we have no guarantee the result would be a commensurate reduction in the acidity of the rainfall. It would seem prudent to adopt policies that are both flexible and adaptable to the changing base of scientific understanding. We may want to choose interim acid rain goals until we reach more scientific knowledge. We may want to give industry considerable flexibility in reaching reduction goals.

Sixth, we cannot pretend that the clean up of acid rain is without cost. Several bills introduced impose a "mill per killowatt hour" charge on all "fossil fuel generated electricity" across the country to fund the installation of pollution control equipment. There are three elements of this we must recognize: First, where utilities have already introduced control technology, it means their customers will be paying a second charge to take care of other plants; second, Penelec—in the area I represent—estimates a millage approach such as reported by the Senate Environment Committee last year would result in a 20-percent increase in utility bills to their customers for each of several years; third, it

must be noted that if the cost is left to the utilities that need the most technology and control equipment, that will largely fall on the people in areas of the country that are already suffering some of the most severe effects of the current economic situation. One way or another the customers are going to cary the bill for controlling acid rain, and we must do it as reasonably as possible.

EPA Administrator Ruckelshaus has called for a sensible, reasonable solution to the acid rain problem with as little economic disruption as possible. I agree on the goal. I think it is attainable.

In a humorous aside to the acid rain problem, Penn State Earth and Mineral Sciences Dean Charles Hosler told me recently that most NO_x comes from cows and rice paddies, so that the best way to attack the problem might be by reducing the number of cows and rice paddies.

While the problem itself is serious, I think the dean's aside helps illustrate that the solutions to acid rain are not laid out in a neat row for us to solve easily. The solution calls for reasonableness, creativity, and understanding. The debate in the next couple of months must be sensible, and all sides need to come together in reaching for solutions that are workable and practical.

I have long argued our environmental, energy, and economic goals can progress side by side as long as we seek reasonable answers. The acid rain debate will be the truest test of our ability to reach that goal. It is one calling for the participation and input of each citizen concerned with these issues.●

RISK ASSESSMENT RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION ACT OF 1983

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, every day Americans in all walks of life, and American businesses of every size and nature are affected by Federal regulations. Many of those regulations seek to protect life, health, and the environment, and aim to implement the Congress' concern for the well-being of the American people and for the appropriate conservation and use of our cherished natural resources. A Federal agency's decision regarding whether and to what extent to regulate are governed by the laws as enacted by Congress and as interpreted in the courts—and it is becoming increasingly evident that both the Congress and the Judiciary are paying increasing attention to the concepts of risk assessment and risk acceptability in the regulatory process. As a result, much regulatory activity now takes place within the framework of assessing the nature and magnitude of risk, and then deciding whether, to what extent, and how a reduction in the level of risk should take place.

Because of the importance of risk assessment and its relationship to the regulatory process, I am today introducing legislation that will authorize studies and reports to enable us to learn more about how risk assessments are currently being carried out, and to make recommendations for the future. The legislation is designed in part to inform this Congress on how the Federal agencies are carrying out our existing mandates regarding risk; the bill does not change the content of any existing law.

Both the Congress in writing the laws, and the courts in interpreting the laws, have required Federal agencies to consider risk and ways of reducing risk. For instance, the Congress specified in the language of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) that certain regulatory actions of the Environmental Protection Agency must be based in part upon a finding of unreasonable risk. Thus the Agency is required under TSCA not only to assess risks, but to also assess whether particular risks are reasonable or unreasonable. In order to give some guidance as to what may be reasonable or unreasonable in given circumstances Congress wrote into the act that "It is the intent of Congress . . . that the Administrator shall consider the environmental, economic, and social impact" of his actions under TSCA.

Also, the courts in interpreting the laws have required risk assessment to be a tool in the regulatory decisionmaking process even where Congress did not use the word "risk" in the section of the law that was the subject of the court decision. Moreover, recently a U.S. court of appeals declared a rule of the Consumer Product Safety Commission to be invalid because of the information that the Commission relied upon in doing its risk assessment.

Agencies are currently doing risk assessments in different ways in part because the laws we have enacted have differing requirements regarding risk regulation; but we also see risk being assessed in different ways under the same law. Such differences can lead to differing agency decisions regarding whether, how, and to what extent to regulate. The regulated community is left uncertain as to the impact of our laws and is less able to plan for the future; and the American people frequently are left without an adequate understanding of why an agency takes, or fails to take, action concerning risk.

My fellow colleagues, this legislation calls for a study designed to learn what is known and what is not known about risk assessment, and to learn how this emerging tool in regulatory decisionmaking can be better employed. This study will involve at least eight Federal agencies and will be coordinated by a Federal agency to be designated by the President. The study is to be conducted in two parts. The first 12-month study will be an overview of existing risk assessment procedures, a review of necessary research, and a proposal for the demonstration projects to follow. This segment will be summarized in a report to Congress 12 months after enactment of this act. During the second 12 months the demonstration projects will be conducted and the results made available to experts in the field for critical peer review and to the public at large. The second segment of the study will be reported to Congress within 30 months after the enactment of this act. The final report to the Congress on this important matter will not only include recommendations concerning how risk assessment processes can be imporved and facilitated, but will also include recommendations on how we can make it possible for the American people to better understand and appreciate the efforts of our Federal agencies to control the risks that affect their daily lives.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS RISK ASSESSMENT RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION ACT OF 1983

Section 1. Section 1 establishes the Title of the Act.

Section 2. Section 2 contains the Congressional findings and declarations, and states that a study is needed to learn what is known and what is not known about assessing risks in the face of incomplete scientific and other information. The Section declares that it is necessary for Federal agencies to use the best possible methods for securing information on, and an understanding of, the scientific bases for their regulatory decisions. Section 2 also states that it is necessary for agencies to delineate as specifically as possible the scientific basis for decisions from their more subjective, judgmental aspects.

Section 3. Section 3 states that the purpose of the Act is to provide for comprehensive and coordinated research and demonstration projects for the study of risk assessment and its relationship to the regulatory process.

Section 4. Section 4 defines the terms used in the Act.

Section 5. This Section provides for the establishment of coordinated interagency projects. After stating the objectives of the projects, the Section provides that the projects will involve, where appropriate, Federal agencies responsible for regulatory decisions or providing information for regulatory decisions, including but not limited to the Food and Drug Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Department of Energy, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and the Department of Transportation. The President will designate an agency

to coordinate the projects, and the coordinating agency will present a report to the Congress within twelve months after enactment of the Act. The report will include a review of risk assessments presently being carried out within designated Federal agencies, including processes used to gather and evaluate information, and the use of risk assessments in the regulatory decision-making process.

Section 6. This Section provides that certain agencies will recommend to the coordinating agency research required to meet the objectives of the projects.

Section 7. Section 7 provides that certain agencies will each undertake a Demonstration Project in the form of a risk assessment typical to that agency. The Section discusses the elements of the studies, requires their completion within two years after the date of enactment, and provides that the studies will be available to experts in the field for critical peer review and to the public at large.

Section 8. This Section requires the coordinating agency to issue a final report to the Congress within thirty months after the date of enactment, and specifies the topics to be covered in the report.

Section 9. Section 9 provides that nothing in the Act shall constitute an authorization for the appropriation of funds from the Treasury of the United States.●

UREA FORMALDEHYDE FOAM INSULATION CORRECTIVE MEASURES ACT

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, during the 1970's, when America was going through a very serious energy crisis, the Government extended thousands of tax credits to people who reduced energy consumption in their homes. One of the products approved by the Government as a tax credit was urea formaldehyde foam insulation (UFFI). The low cost and easy installation made it a popular form of insulation. By the end of the decade, over 500,000 homeowners across the Nation were insulated with UFFI; nearly 70,000 of those are believed to be in my home State of Michigan.

Soon after its installation, people began developing a variety of health problems, but it was not until a few years later that studies linked small levels of formaldehyde gas with eye, nose, and throat irritation, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, headaches, irritability, and skin rashes. Other tests show it induces cancer in animals.

Based on unreasonable risks to consumers from the irritation, sensitization, and possible carcinogenic effects of formaldehyde emitted by UFFI, the Consumer Product Safety Commission banned the use of UFFI in homes and schools in 1982. While this step was a necessary health caution, it did not solve the formaldehyde problem in homes already insulated with UFFI. Homeowners with UFFI have found that because of the adverse health effects of this insulation their homes have decreased in value or are unsaleable. The problem is further complicated by the cost of removal which ranges from $6,000 to $20,000.

A similar problem involving UFFI occurred in Canada and is now being remedied by a UFFI response program. The Government-sponsored program helps homeowners improve the indoor air quality, which in some cases means removing the UFFI.

My bill, the Urea Formaldehyde Foam Insulation Corrective Measures Act, is based largely on this practical program. The bill follows:

H.R. 3819

A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to assist homeowners in taking corrective measures with respect to urea formaldehyde foam insulation in their homes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Urea Formaldehyde Foam Insulation Corrective Measures Act".

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO HOMEOWNERS

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may make, and enter into contracts to make, grants to any person eligible under section 4 for purposes of assisting such person in taking corrective measures with respect to urea formaldehyde foam insulation in a home owned by such person, or reimbursing such person for expenses incurred in taking such corrective measures.

(b) Grants received under this section may be used only for the following expenses relating to the taking of corrective measures with respect to urea formaldehyde foam insulation in a home:

(1) fees charged for the services of a contractor;

(2) fees charged for building permits;

(3) fees charged for the provision of estimates;

(4) fees charged for laboratory and onsite testing;

(5) fees charged for information;

(6) fees charged for materials;

(7) fees charged for the rental or, when appropriate, the purchase of equipment, including safety equipment;

(8) expenses incurred in cleaning a home that are required as a result of corrective measures taken in such home; and

(9) any other expense determined by the Secretary to be reasonable and directly related to the taking of corrective measures with respect to urea formaldehyde foam insulation in a home.

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), each grant under this section shall be in an amount determined by the Secretary to be appropriate, taking into consideration the expenses of the homeowner involved, the number of applicants for grants under this section, and the amount of funds available for such grants.

(2) No grant under this section may be for an amount exceeding $10,000.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO HOMEOWNERS

SEC. 3. The Secretary may provide technical information and assistance—

(1) to any homeowner, to assist such homeowner in identifying the presence of formaldehyde foam insulation in a home of such homeowner and detecting and measuring the level of formaldehyde gas in such home; and

(2) to any person eligible under section 4, to assist such person in taking corrective measures with respect to urea formaldehyde foam insulation in a home owned by such person.

ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE

SEC. 4. (a) A person shall be eligible for assistance under section 2 or 3(2) only if such person—

(1)(A) is the owner of a home insulated with urea formaldehyde foam insulation, which home has levels of formaldehyde gas that exceed 0.1 part per million or such lower amount as the Secretary determines may cause adverse effects on the health of any resident of such home; or

(B) is or was the owner of a home insulated with urea formaldehyde foam insulation, which home had or is likely to have had levels of formaldehyde gas that exceeded 0.1 part per million or such lower amount as the Secretary determines may cause adverse effects on the health of any resident of such home, and incurred expenses in taking corrective measures with respect to such insulation after December 31, 1969; and

(2) submits an application for such assistance not later than the expiration of the 18-month period following publication of notice of the availability of such assistance under section 5(b).

(b) No person may receive assistance under this Act with respect to more than three homes.

APPLICATION FOR ASSISTANCE

SEC. 5. (a) Application for assistance under this Act shall be in such form, and according to such procedures, as the Secretary shall prescribe.

(b) As soon as practicable following the availability of funds to carry out the Act, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a notice of the availability of assistance under the Act. Such notice shall include a clear and concise description of the program of assistance established in this Act, the requirements for eligibility for such assistance, and the procedures for applying for such assistance.

AUDITS AND INSPECTIONS

SEC. 6. The Secretary shall conduct such audits of expenses and home inspections as the Secretary determines are appropriate to ensure that assistance provided under this Act is utilized in accordance with the requirements set forth in this Act and in any regulations issued by the Secretary under this Act.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 7. Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. The Secretary may revise such regulations from time to time, as the Secretary determines necessary.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall annually prepare and submit to the Congress a comprehensive report describing the activities of the Secretary in carrying out the program

of assistance established in this Act. Such report shall include any recommendations for modifications in such program that the Secretary considers necessary or desirable as a result of administering such program.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "corrective measure" means—

(A) an improvement in the sealing of interior surfaces of exterior walls in a home in a manner that prevents or effectively reduces the emission of formaldehyde gas from urea formaldehyde foam insulation into living areas in such home;

(B) an improvement in the ventilation of living areas and urea formaldehyde foam insulated wall cavities in a home in a manner that facilitates the dispersal of formaldehyde gas and prevents excessive moisture;

(C) the addition of an air-to-air heat exchanger in a home in a manner that facilitates the retention of heat while increasing ventilation;

(D) the partial or complete removal of urea formaldehyde foam insulation in a home; or

(E) any reasonable action taken with respect to a home containing urea formaldehyde foam insulation that is determined by the Secretary to effectively reduce the level of formaldehyde gas in such home.

(2) The term "home" means a one-to four-family dwelling or a manufactured home.

(3) The term "homeowner" means the owner of a home.

(4) The term "manufactured home" means a structure, transportable in one or more sections, that is built on a permanent chassis and designed as a dwelling with or without a permanent foundation when connected to required utilities. Such term includes the plumbing, heating, air-conditioning, and electrical systems contained in such structure.

(5) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; LIMITATION ON CONTRACT AUTHORITY

SEC. 10. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act not to exceed $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1985. Any amount appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(b) Any authority under this Act to enter into contracts obligating amounts to be expended by the Federal Government shall be effective for any fiscal year only to the extent or in such amounts as are provided in advance by appropriation Acts.

I believe the Government has an obligation to help those who responded to its appeal for more efficient energy consumption by assisting them in their need to remedy this dangerous situation.●

A BACKFIRING WEAPON

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in a matter of weeks, the United States will take the first steps in a new, and probably uncontrollable, arms race. During August, the Air Force will begin flight testing of a sophisticated antisatellite weapon (ASAT). The new weapon, essentially an air-to-air missile equipped with a special homing device, will be launched from an F-15 aircraft. Once deployed, the U.S. ASAT will make every Soviet satellite vulnerable to swift destruction.

At present, the Soviet Union possesses an ASAT much more primitive than our own; it is incapable of reaching any of our strategically important satellites, which fly in extremely high orbits.

Both the United States and the Soviet Union have much to gain from a negotiated test ban on ASAT's. Our Armed Forces, and thus the reliability of our deterrent, are much more dependent on satellites than are those of the Soviet Union. Over 60 percent of our overseas military communications, for example, are transmitted via satellite. So, in the long run, it is to our advantage to avoid provoking a contest to create the best satellite killer. It is in the Soviet Union's interest to agree to a ban on ASAT's because of the superiority of our weapon.

Because our ASAT will be launchable from F-15's based all over the globe, its deployment will have an extraordinarily destabilizing effect on the balance of arms between the United States and the U.S.S.R. Almost certainly, the result will be a spiral of increasingly sophisticated technology, costing ever greater sums of money, yet providing less and less real security. The ASAT truly represents, to use Thoreau's phrase, "an improved means to an unimproved end."

The dangers posed by the further development of the ASAT to the United States, and thus to world, security are powerfully set out in an article which recently appeared on the New York Times op-ed page by Kurt Gottfried, a distinguished physicist at my alma mater, Cornell University. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New York Times]

A BACKFIRING WEAPON

(By Kurt Gottfried)

ITHACA.—ASAT, yet another acronym, has begun to invade the news columns. One is told that it is an antisatellite—a device that can destroy a satellite. But that still leaves many unanswered questions.

How does an ASAT differ from an antiballistic missile, or ABM, a device that can destroy an intercontinental ballistic missile, or ICBM, in flight? Satellites are much more fragile than ICBM's and stay in orbit for weeks. ICBM's are vulnerable for only a few minutes, so striking a swarm of them is a prodigious problem. Therefore, even an ineffective ABM could be a wonderful ASAT.

Do treaties allow ABM's? The 1972 ABM treaty does not permit the field testing of the laser ABM's alluded to by the President in his "Star Wars" speech. To quote the Arms Control Impact Statement the President sent to Congress in April, "The ABM treaty prohibition on development, testing and deployment of space-based ABM systems applies directly to directed-energy technology," that is, to lasers, etc.

Are ASAT's forbidden by treaties? Existing treaties impose no effective restraints on ASAT development or testing, even though there is a relationship between ABM's and ASAT's. Since an ABM system could, in its infancy, already be an effective ASAT, it could masquerade as such to evade the ABM treaty. By the same token, a program to develop only ASAT's could be misperceived as a budding ABM by the other side. ASAT's could therefore trigger enormous buildups of offensive missiles, which is precisely what the ABM treaty was designed to prevent.

What are the attitudes of the superpowers to weapons in space?

The Administration will not resume negotiations on limiting ASAT's. This stance is perfectly consistent with its long-range strategy, as laid down in the Defense Guidance, the Pentagon's five-year master plan. The plan assumes that the United States must be able to "prevail" in nuclear war; therefore, it must be able to "deny the enemy the use of his space systems" and "insure that treaties and agreements do not foreclose opportunities to develop these capabilities."

The White House wants to renegotiate the ABM treaty to allow spacebased ABM's, as it made clear yet again on June 18 in an amicable response to a speech by Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko. Are the superpowers on the same wavelength for once?

They are not. The Kremlin has used every opportunity to suggest an interest in ASAT arms control and opposition to new-fangled ABM's, as exemplified by a remarkable advertisement in The New York Times by leading Soviet scientists attacking spacebased ABM's.

Why do the two Governments take opposite sides on what seems to be only a technical issue? The Administration's motives were spelled out in the Defense Guidance and more recently by the White House: Our technological superiority should be applied to the difficult art of space weaponary to regain and hold strategic superiority. While Soviet motives are hard to assess, they are probably the other side of the same coin: A healthy respect for American technology and a fear that an arms race in space would be terribly expensive and hazardous. Indeed, they must now see that the major accomplishment of their inept 15-year ASAT project has been to justify an American program that is about to produce a much more potent weapon.

Does that not mean that the Administration's policy is best suited to American interests? Speaking first of ASAT, the United States, with its forces spread across the globe and facing a secretive adversary, relies heavily on satellites for communication and intelligence. In contrast, Soviet forces are mainly on or close to the Eurasian landmass and depend primarily on land-based and airborne communications. The United States would therefore be the loser if both sides acquired effective ASAT's.

But will the Soviet Union ever build effective space weapons? The United States has usually been first with sophisticated weapons: nuclear bombs, multiple independently targetable missiles, or MIRV's, submarine-based missiles, etc. The Soviet Union has always followed suit. Often their weapons are blunderbusses compared with American designs, but that does not make them less lethal. And in the case of ABM's, it is far more difficult to build a missile defense than to circumvent and overwhelm it.

In short, the Administration's military space policy rests on the assumption that, for the first time, the Soviet Union will not be able to respond effectively to a major threat to its security. Whether or not this conjecture is correct is not essential. If right, we can look forward to desperate Soviet reactions at least as dangerous as the Cuba missile crisis; if wrong, we can look forward to a standoff at a drastically reduced margin of safety.●

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON THE HOMELESS AND THE HUNGRY

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which calls upon the President to convene a White House Conference on the Homeless and the Hungry.

We do not need a "blue ribbon task force" to verify that the worst recession since the Great Depression is still victimizing many Americans with the twin national tragedies of homelessness and hunger. Immediate answers are needed to put roofs over the heads of families and individuals sleeping in their cars, in tent cities, or in abandoned buildings. It has been estimated that the number of homeless in America is between 500,000 and 2,000,000.

In addition, we need to direct some of the record amounts of food stored in Government warehouses to the Nation's hungry, the number of whom has grown substantially in the past year. A task force will only reconfirm that charitable groups have been severely strained trying to feed the hungry while the Federal Government has reduced its commitment to basic shelter and food.

As an example, one charitable group, the National Conference of Catholic Charities, reports that the number of emergency meals they provided jumped from 496,000 to nearly 1,000,000 between 1981 and 1982. Since this is but one group, these figures represent only the tip of the iceberg.

We consider ourselves to be one of the most affluent nations in the world, but these numbers of Americans who are homeless and who go hungry tell us how far we have to go.

In America there is now a "new poor," the middle class families whose breadwinners have been unemployed for so long that benefits and savings have run out. Many have been evicted, or soon face eviction, from their homes because they can no longer pay their mortgage. For the first time, mothers and fathers of these families are forced to stand at soup kitchens for a handout so that they and their children may eat. These families are swelling the ranks of the homeless and the hungry.

In our cities, building deterioration or collapse, fire, overcrowding, condemnation, cutbacks in new construction and rehabilitation initiatives, and the unavailability of decent and affordable low-income housing have contributed to the problems facing a new breed of exile—the "urban refugee"—welfare families who have been displaced and are homeless. In some instances, cities have been forced to provide short-term hotel housing for homeless families to alleviate this shortage. I have visited these sited with the chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, who has joined me in cosponsoring this bill, and we have seen that these places are not suitable for family life. Such hotel lodging is sorely deficient in safety and security for the families. There are no health care and counseling facilities, nor are there cooking or refrigeration facilities so that the children may eat good meals. The children have no recreational facilities. The hotels are often located in an unfamiliar area far from family, friends, neighborhoods, and schools.

This emergency lodging is obtained at considerable expense. Monthly rents at the hotels we visited are upwards of $1,000, the cost of which is borne by local, State, and Federal taxpayers. The construction or rehabilitation of temporary emergency housing would be far more cost-effective.

The number of Americans under the poverty level has risen to 15 percent. Many of these people—who are of all ages, from infants to the elderly—go to bed hungry. The plight of the hungry has been harshly spotlighted by the long lines waiting to receive free cheese from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In the meantime, the Federal Government has reported record amounts of wheat, dairy products, and other staples being stored away. All this while Americans suffer from lack of food.

Because we have these problems, we must call together the people who understand the magnitude of the issue and who can brainstorm for solutions. For this reason the House should call upon the President to convene a White House Conference on the Homeless and the Hungry. Federal, State, and local government officials should meet with representatives of charitable organizations and community-based groups for answers and action.

We need to provide long-range planning to insure appropriate shelter and proper nutrition for all families and individuals who are in need. We must accelerate the availability of community-based emergency facilities to house the homeless and feed the hungry, and we must give them the resources to do the job.

We must explore incentives for private developers and cities to rehabilitate units, including abandoned urban buildings, which may be used to house the homeless.

We must take advantage of the bounty of our Nation's farmers, which has filled our warehouses with grains, dairy products, and other staples. It is truly a shame that Americans go hungry while this administration quibbles over how much surplus food should be released.

Finally, we must improve data collection to ascertain the extent of the problem of America's homeless and hungry so that adequate resources may be devoted to its solution.

I strongly urge my colleagues to call upon the President to convene a White House Conference on the Homeless and the Hungry. We know there is a problem; what we must find now are solutions.●

TRIBUTE TO RUTH DAZLE

HON. RON de LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the innovation and determined efforts of a very special woman in my community, the U.S. Virgin Islands. When the Virgin Islands Department of Education was forced to cancel summer school sessions due to financial difficulties, Ruth Dazle responded quickly and creatively. She sought and obtained the finances, space, and tutors necessary to establish a tutorial program to assist 70 youngsters who otherwise could not have had this opportunity at all this summer. Not only is Ruth Dazle a woman with a big heart, she is a woman of action and determination. I salute her and I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to share with you and the Members of this House the achievements of this remarkable woman, Ruth Dazle.

I would like to submit the following article and editorial which appeared in the St. Thomas Daily News to the RECORD, as I feel it best captures the efforts of this dedicated lady.

A DAZLEING SOLUTION TO SUMMER SCHOOL CUTS

(By Philip G. Harrigan, Daily News staff)

When school officials announced, just weeks before school closed, that there would be no summer sessions in the public school system, a lot of parents were alarmed.

For those who could not afford private summer classes, it meant their children would be deprived of the extra schooling needed to pull up grade averages and, in some cases, advance to the next grade.

But then one woman decided to do something about it. She started her own free summer-school program.

The Youth Tutorial Program, under the supervision of Ruth Dazle, began June 21 after Dazle decided to "try to do something for the children."

Initially, she said, she went to local businesses to find a sponsor, and approached Randy Knight, president of Cable TV, with her summer school concept. Knight liked to the idea.

"I agreed to sponsor the tutors and purchase the supplies," Knight said. The tutors are six young women who instruct about 70 youngsters. The students range from preschoolers to ninth-graders, with first-to-third graders comprising the largest concentration.

Dazle also arranged for a federally sponsored hot-lunch program for her students. Until the lunch program got underway, she fed them herself.

And, when the lunch program ends in two weeks, almost three weeks short of the Youth Tutorial Program's Aug. 31 ending date, Dazle again will take it upon herself to feed the children.

"There should be a lot more people like Ruth Dazle," said Knight. He called her program "fantastic," and said it should be an example to others to "really get involved" in helping V.I. youth.

The Youth Tutorial Program classes are held Monday through Thursday, with Friday a "recreation day" for the students. "Trips to the beach and fashion shows are scheduled as changes of pace.

Academic work, however, is the focal point of the program, and students are taught mathematics, English, science, history and home economics. Classes run from 9 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

With such a large group to contend with, Dazle said, the only "major problem I had with the children has been discipline." She smilingly added that she and the children, "have crossed over that bridge now."

"As parents, we get aggravated most of the time with teachers," she said. "But when you have to do it yourself—you understand." Dazle has been able to understand the rewards, as well as the stresses, of teaching, saying, "the attitudes of my children have improved 100 percent."

Dazle, who in addition to running the program is a member of the St. Thomas-St. John Community Crime Committee, a United Way board member, a member of the League of Women Voters and the chairperson of Tenants United For Fairness (in whose offices the tutorial program is housed), feels that someone has to take the interests of island youth to heart.

"I'd do it anytime I had to," she said of her program, "just to save the kids."

A REMARKABLE WOMAN

If the Virgin Islands had more Ruth Dazles, think what we could accomplish.

Here is a woman with imagination and energy, a woman whose waking hours are devoted to making life better for all of us, and particularly for those whose needs often are pushed aside or forgotten.

Single-handedly, she has set up a tutorial program for 70 children to make up in some small way for the cancellation of summer school by the Department of Education.

She got the money from Cable TV to cover the cost of salaries and supplies. She found space in the Oswald Harris Court headquarters of Tenants United for Fairness, the organization she heads. She arranged for the federally funded school-lunch program to supply hot meals for the children. She hired the six tutors.

The result: a thriving tutorial program that will help 70 youngsters get a head start on next year's academic demands—and allow them to have some fun in the process.

Ruth Dazle is a remarkable woman who contributes to the well-being of these islands in innumerable ways. This is just our small way of saying thank you.●

REV. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING'S BIRTHDAY

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1983

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Members of the House of Representatives for voting to make the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday a national holiday.

In the years since emancipation, black Americans have had the good fortune of being addressed by a series of extraordinary leaders—men whose generosity, magnanimity, and limitless good will exemplify the human greatness Americans are capable of. We were lucky to live during the lifetime of one such leader, the Reverend Dr. King. In a way, Dr. King's thought incorporates much of the best of his most thoughtful predecessors—such as Booker T. and even Augustus Washington, Frederick Douglass, Burghardt DuBois, founder of the NAACP, and James Weldon Johnson.

I am reminded here of Frederick Douglass' masterful oration to Abraham Lincoln. "Truth compels me to admit * * * Abraham Lincoln was not, in the fullest sense of the word, either our man or our model," Douglass said. Yet he honored Lincoln above everyone for delivering his people from the world's cruelest slavery.

Dr. King was our conscience. He never allowed us a minute to forget that this country was called to a special mission, to learn and to teach the world that equality in human rights means equality for all human beings. But, more profoundly, he taught us that the legal principle of equality must be transcended by love, and that the bonds of human affection legitimate the law of equality. Reverend Dr. King brought us back again to the classical and Judaeo-Christian insight that the root of politics lies in the soul, and the goal of politics is the cultivation of character. Human dignity is truly an ideal that knows no color distinctions.

By honoring this great-souled teacher, we honor our country's principles and our true selves.●

PROTECTION FOR THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of H.R. 2957, International Recovery and Financial Stability Act, I joined with the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PATTERSON) in offering an amendment to protect the rights of the Republic of China as a member of the Asian Development Bank. Our amendment simply stated that should the Republic of China be denied full membership in the ADB, the United States will terminate its support for that institution. I am pleased that the amendment, supported by both sides of the aisle, was accepted overwhelmingly.

Through an inadvertance, my remarks on the amendment were not included in the RECORD of yesterday. Therefore, I ask that they be included here, along with the text of the amendment, and that they appear in the permanent RECORD in the appropriate place.

Page 46, after line 8, insert the following:

"(c) Whereas the Republic of China is a charter member in good standing of the Asian Development Bank;

"Whereas the Republic of China has grown from a borrower to a lender in the Asian Development Bank; and

"Whereas the Republic of China provides, through its economic success, a model for other nations in Asia: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that the support provided by the United States to the Asian Development Bank will be terminated if the Republic of China is denied full membership in the Asian Development Bank.".

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the consideration of the gentleman from California and that of the chairman and ranking member of the committee in accepting this important amendment which protects the rights of the Republic of China in the Asian Development Bank.

This amendment is offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) and myself in order to preserve the Republic of China as a full member in good standing of the Asian Development Bank. In recent months, the People's Republic of China has asked to join the ADB with the unfortunate condition that the Republic of China be expelled. Without prejudicing the application of the PRC, we believe that the status of the ROC should be guaranteed.

The Republic of China has been a member in good standing of the ADB since its founding in 1967. It was a charter member. The record of economic achievement over that time—a

record made possible by sound economic policies and the hard work of the people of this island nation—is well known. Over the 17 years, this economic achievement has enabled the ROC to graduate from a borrower from the bank to a lender to its fellow Asian nations.

Mr. Chairman, it is important for the United States to send an unmistakable signal to the management of the ADB and to the other members that we will not tolerate the expulsion of the ROC or an involuntary reduction in its status. Membership in the ADB of the People's Republic must be considered on its own merits without any effect on the status of other members.●

U.S. INSPECTORS HAZARD

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper article from the El Paso Times. I commend this unique situation concerning U.S. Customs inspectors to my colleagues, and I believe it underscores the critical need for increased numbers of inspectors in order to expedite crossings at our international bridges for personal health reasons as well as air quality considerations.

The article is as follows:

[From the El Paso Times, July 25, 1983]

EXHAUST TAKES TOLL ON BRIDGE INSPECTORS

(By James Maish)

Some days, U.S. Customs Service inspector Allen Bell wants to slam the door when a smoke-belching vehicle approaches his booth at the Paso Del Norte Bridge.

His second impulse, though, says do the job, which he does.

"Sometimes there are days when I feel like if I take a deep breath of air out here, I could chip a tooth on it." Bell said, watching a steady stream of cars, taxis and buses pouring across into El Paso from Juarez.

"Look there goes another one," he said, pointing to a white pickup truck pouring out bluish exhaust into a hot July afternoon.

Fifteen years after the federal government first conducted air quality tests at El Paso's border bridges, customs and immigration officials face what many see as worse breathing conditions than ever.

These tests demonstrated that carbon monoxide levels far exceeded federal standards at times, mainly at the Paso Del Norte Bridge Downtown. The human exposure factor was within accepted limits, though.

Since then, the federal government has started a worker rotation system and installed blowers to disperse fumes.

But the problem has outpaced the solutions, inspectors say.

Many more El Pasoans, for example, are filling their tanks with the still inexpensive but lower-grade gasoline in Juarez. And the U.S. inspectors live with the aerial byproducts.

"I am resigned to the fact that I have to live with (the air)," said customs inspector Raul Mandora, 53, a 12-year bridge veteran.

Little research evidence has linked heavy carbon monoxide exposure to later long-term health problems.

It is small consolation to bridge workers, though, whose booth windows have to be washed every two days to remove exhaust soot.

Some inspectors say the federal government should consider giving hazard pay to bridge inspectors and allow them to take early retirement.

Other inspectors suggest building a new bridge on the East Side to alleviate bridge congestion. They propose wearing masks or enforcement of federal air standards at American ports of entry.

Each answer—some tried, some too expensive—has its problems.

Masks cause a public relations problem, Mendoza said. "People think you are sick or something."

Customs inspector Joe Najar said he is not holding his breath that air quality changes will happen soon at the Paso Del Norte Bridge.

Najar is president of the 250-member National Treasury Employees Union in El Paso. The union includes customs inspectors, clerks and patrol officers.

Repeated federal and local air-quality tests on the bridges have shown levels of carbon monoxide in excess of federal standards.

A 1979 federal study by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration showed Lane 1—nearest the Paso Del Norte Bridge office—routinely exceeded carbon monoxide standards by 50 percent.

However, the Tri-Agency Border Survey noted that worker exposure to the high levels of carbon monoxide in El Paso fell within federal standards.

The federal study recommended better air-conditioning, maintenance, improved traffic control such as speed bumps and signals, and future construction with prevailing winds in mind.

"Available studies on the long-term effects of continued exposure to low levels of (carbon monoxide) are scarce," the study states. It said employees failed to document ailments related to air quality.

Telltale symptoms of carbon monoxide poisoning include headaches, fainting spells, nausea, lethargy and irritability.

Immigration inspector Norman Fisher said he knows them. When he complained that fumes were making him ill, he was told to look for another job, he said.

"You can quote me on that. Most of us are told the same thing," said Fisher, who is president of the American Federation of Government Employees Local 1210.

His El Paso union represents about 150 immigration inspectors, detention officers and secretaries, among others, in El Paso.

Fisher said his work hours were cut after he complained. He had to file a grievance to have the hours reinstated.

Fisher said the problem is not confined to the outdoors.●

MONTHLY REPORTING FOR AFDC RECIPIENTS SHOULD BE STATE OPTION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would make the use of monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting a State option rather than a mandatory Federal requirement in the aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) program.

Most States have found the monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting requirement to be costly to administer and ineffective as a way to reduce error rates. In fact, they have found that error rates have gone up as a result of the degree of difficulty that recipients have in complying with the complexities of monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting.

Findings recently made available from a number of demonstration projects provide hard research data to confirm that monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting also results in the denial of benefits for needy families. Researchers in Michigan found that over 90 percent of those who were terminated form AFDC for failure to file a monthly report were poor families who met the eligibility criteria in every other respect. Surely, when Congress adopted monthly reporting are retrospective budgeting, we had no intention of denying benefits to those who are eligible. But that is in effect what is happening.

Furthermore, demonstration projects in Michigan and Colorado found that no statistically significant savings result from monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting. In the face of such evidence, I can see no justification for continuing a policy which is administratively costly and which denies benefits to those whom Congress have made eligible for AFPC.

Presently, States are required to reduce AFDC error rates to very low levels or face substantial penalties. If monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting were an option, States would be able to implement the most effective methods to reduce errors, and would not be required to divert substantial resources from proven methods in order to institute a costly monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting system.

To date, 32 State human service directors have written to Secretary Heckler, Secretary Block, and Members of Congress to express their support for legislation which would make monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting an option to the States in both the AFDC and food stamp pro-

grams. Congressman JIM MOODY has introduced a companion bill (H.R. 3557) which would make monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting an option for the food stamp program.

The American Public Welfare Administration has voted unanimously in support of making monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting an option to the States. The Food Research Action Center (FRAC) as well as many other local advocacy groups and local administering agencies support this bill. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that changing the current mandatory requirement to a State option will cost little if anything.

Under the bill I am introducing today, monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting would be made an option to the States. In addition, the bill would hold States harmless for their inability to implement monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting since their inception as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act. Finally, these provisions would expand the Department of Health and Human Services waiver authority to permit full compatibility for the monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting requirement between both the AFDC and food stamp program.

The following is a list of the States which have written Secretary Heckler, Secretary Block, and Congress on this issue:

Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.●

H.R. 2715

HON. NORMAN SISISKY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague, Mr. WHITEHURST, for his efforts to correct the inequities which are experienced by many long-term former military spouses. The Uniformed Services Former Spouses Protection Act which was sponsored by Congressman WHITEHURST and passed during the 97th Congress was a major step in solving the problems faced by women who have participated in the military as service wives.

However, for a variety of reasons, many former military spouses continue to be neglected and treated unjustly. For example, the former spouses legislation, as it pertains to medical care, only affects spouses who divorced after February 1, 1983. Consequently, many women who have served their country and their family are still denied military privileges and vital health care simply because their divorces occurred before the legislation was enacted.

For these reasons, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Uniformed Services Former Spouses Health Care Act of 1983 (H.R. 2175), which seeks to correct this injustice by extending military privileges to all deserving former spouses regardless of the date of divorce, dissolution, or annulment of the marriage.

Furthermore, H.R. 2715 revises the qualifying criteria for military benefits to include former spouses who have acquired a disease or disability due to the nature or location of the member of former service.

It would also include former spouses who were married for at least 20 years to an active military member, only 10 years of which need to include active military service.

Prior legislation extending military privileges to former military spouses is too restrictive and continues to prevent deserving former spouses from receiving benefits and health care they desperately need. I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2715 as an effort to address this problem and to demonstrate our concern for military spouses whose service and sacrifice must not be overlooked.●

STATEMENT ON IMF FUNDING

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, the vote yesterday on supplying the International Monetary Fund with an additional $8.4 billion in lending authority out of the pockets of America's taxpayers was, I think, a very large mistake. I voted against this authorization, and I would like today to make very clear the reasons lying behind that negative vote. Despite all the maneuvering, and the manipulation, and the administration arm-twisting, my position on this bill remains as it was in the beginning. Put quite simply, this was a totally unnecessary expenditure of funds, designed to do little more than make sure that some of our go-go bankers, who got in over their heads on shaky loans to foreign countries, would not have to pay for their own mistakes.

It continues to amaze me how this administration, which will fight tooth and nail against spending funds for child nutrition programs, which opposes with its last breath an attempt to provide temporary loan assistance for hard-working Americans whose homes are being foreclosed out from under them, and which opposes a 4-percent pay increase for our military personnel, all in the name of budgetary constraints, can all of a sudden pull out all the stops to lobby in favor of over $8 billion more to make sure that the international bankers do not have to accept the consequences for their own foolish mistakes.

Of course, we were told, time and time again, that this bill was not a bailout for these bankers. We were told that, by assuring the prosperity of the countries that these IMF loans go to that we will be assuring markets for our exports, particularly agricultural exports. If this were true, I would have had to perhaps revise my position on this bill. If this had in fact been the case, I would have voted for this bill.

My State, South Dakota, is primarily an agricultural State. It depends a great deal on export of its agricultural products. However, providing another $8.4 billion of our taxpayers' money to the IMF will not help our agricultural exports. On the contrary, it will probably harm them. This is so for a very simple reason. The IMF has a history of conditioning its loans to client countries with a number of domestic policy changes. Chief among those changes is a requirement that the client countries put in strong incentives to reduce their imports, and increase their exports. In other words, by making more loan authority available to the IMF, we are encouraging this organization to go into other countries and convince them to stop importing products, including our own agricultural products. How this improves our export markets totally escapes me.

If the proponents of this bill, including the administration, are so concerned about our agricultural exports, I have a suggestion for them. Take the $8.4 billion we are talking about here, cut it in half, and apply it to subsidizing our own grain sales abroad. Over $4 billion in export subsidies would have a tremendous positive effect on the export of our agricultural products, and it would have a direct effect, unlike the Rube Goldberg machinations that the IMF would make client countries go through.

There is one final point to be raised. With the acceptance of the ST GERMAIN amendment to this bill last week, many of my colleagues may have thought that we had sufficiently changed the bill to make sure that it would not be a bank bail-out, and that we had conditioned IMF loans to make sure that they do not work against our own exports, as they have in the past. Unfortunately, this is simple not true.

The Wall Street Journal, in a surprisingly frank editorial, laid out publicly just what this maneuver amounts to. In that editorial, which I am insert-

ing in the RECORD at the end of my remarks, the Journal says:

The game now is to get something-anything-into conference committee with the Senate, which approved the $8.4 billion last May. Then proponents conceivably could come back to the House floor with a compromise that can be used to outflank their foes.

We have now sent this bill into conference, and it remains to be seen if in fact the even minimal protections we have inserted into the bill will survive that conference. Frankly, I am disposed to think that they will not. The administration has probably won its battle to bail out the big banks. However, I would like to take this opportunity to go on record as making it very clear that it will be difficult for me in the future to take the administration's pious pronouncements about its commitment to budgetary responsibility very seriously. Spending $8.4 billion in an enterprise of extremely dubious value, which will have the immediate effect of hurting our agricultural export market, seems to me to be a particularly glaring example of budgetary irresponsibility. I suppose I should not be surprised, however. This is, after all, the administration that has given us record budget deficits, stretching down the years as far as the eye can see.

The Journal editorial follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 1, 1983]

THE SKY HASN'T FALLEN

Backers of the proposal to increase the U.S. contribution to the International Monetary Fund by $8.4 billion staved off several attacks in the House Friday, but the bill still faces an uncertain future. It has been languishing in the House for nearly three months, and the 40 or so amendments still awaiting it testify to the difficulty of putting together a winning coalition.

But the future of the administration and congressional leadership to gain approval for the bill hasn't caused the sky to fall. And it isn't likely to, despite the predictions of proponents who say the financial system will collapse if billions aren't spent to bail out the countries and banks that got themselves into trouble during the roaring '70s.

In theory, the IMF is supposed to help the international system adjust to the new economic realities by imposing sensible fiscal and monetary policies on debtor nations in return for new loans. In fact, the promise of handouts from the IMF is likely in many cases to delay adjustment, because not even the sages who run the IMF know how to fix every country's economy and many debtors will use the money to defer taking the necessary steps themselves.

Proponents of the IMF, including the administration, nevertheless are busy trying to breathe life back into the authorizing legislation by offering goodies left and right, so to speak. To placate liberals, there have been amendments to turn the bill into a bash-the-banks measure, as well as all sorts of "understandings" about everybody's pet domestic spending programs. To garner votes from conservatives, an amendment has been incorporated that holds out the vague promise of a conference to discuss international monetary reform, such as a gold standard. Last week, language was inserted that would require Treasury Department certification of a crisis before much of the money could be loaned out—though this clearly was a fig leaf, since the Treasury already has said it thinks there is a crisis.

The game now is to get something—anything—into conference committee with the Senate, which approved the $8.4 billion last May. Then proponents conceivably could come back to the House floor with a "compromise" that can be used to outflank their foes.

Even if that parliamentary maneuver doesn't succeed, the IMF and its backers have a trick or two left up their sleeves. At this September's annual meeting of the IMF, there's likely to be a big push to expand something known as Special Drawing Rights. These are pieces of paper that are issued to member countries and that can then, in theory at least, be swapped for hard currencies at the discretion of the IMF. So far not much swapping has been done, because countries with hard currency aren't very eager to hold SDRs. But the failure of Congress to give the IMF real money to play with has sent its bureaucrats scurrying to the drawing boards to plot a way to animate this backdoor technique for sustaining their empire.

So the game isn't over yet. But we aren't unhappy to see the IMF bill in serious trouble. It was getting to be too costly. And much as we would like some attention given to reforming the international monetary system, we suspect $8.4 billion is a little stiff for the Treasury's vague offer of a conference on the subject. Besides, the last thing the monetary system needs is a new flood of liquidity showered on the less productive economies at the expense of the more productive.●

SENIOR CITIZENS INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY CARE ACT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Senior Citizens Independent Community Care Act.

In the coming years, a larger and larger percentage of our population will joined the ranks of senior citizens. As their numbers increase, so will their need for long-term medical care. Unfortunately, our existing laws either encourage expensive institutional care or no medical care at all.

Yet many of our elderly who have medical disabilities do not require, nor can they afford to receive institutional care. In many of these cases, the individual would be much better off if they could stay in their own neighborhoods. For all too many seniors, the removal from familiar surroundings to an institution results in a worsening of their mental, if not their physical condition. But without some sort of assistance, staying at home or with a relative is out of the question.

Medicare has focused almost exclusively on institutional acute short term care, specifically excluding any form of custodial care.

The only instance where medicare has provided some sensitivity to the growing needs of the chronically ill and disabled is in skilled nursing services. The 1982 tax bill, eliminated the prior hospitalization requirement for these services. However, limitations inherent in the eligibility for skilled nursing remain, and the weekly limit on home health aid has been cut from 20 hours to 9 hours. Regulatory limits have been tightened to the point that congressional efforts to liberalize benefits for noninstitutional care have been more than canceled out.

This leaves medicaid as the primary source of funding for long-term care. Problems and shortcomings are also inherent in this policy. First and foremost, the program covers only the very poor. In 1980 only 13 percent of the 25.7 million elderly people in this country were covered. In addition, medicaid imposes a great financial burden on States, long-term care being the fastest growing part of that burden. There is a problem of continuity of care. Benefits—if they exist at all—are fragmented between medicare, medicaid, and those extraneous sources available to the 87 percent who do not qualify for medicaid.

Unfortunately the current medicaid program promotes dependency by limiting eligibility to those who are already financially destitute or those who make themselves destitute for this purpose. A 1974 survey by CBO found that nearly one-half of medicaid nursing home patients were not initially poor by State definitions but were forces to deplete their resources in order to qualify as medically needy. Given the rising costs of care, this percentage has most certainly increased since that time.

There are still other problems with the present medicaid program. Couples too frequently are forced to divorce so that one spouse can get a nursing home subsidy without impoverishing the other. The policy often results in covert violations of the law by families attempting to transfer their parents' assets before their admission to nursing homes.

It is also clear to me that we cannot finance a new medicare program as a cost reimbursed service. The perverse incentives within our health care system simply encourage providers to increase services rather than look for alternatives and efficiencies. Personally, I would hope that we can:

Move long-term care into the mainstream of the health care system.

Convert the health care system from cost based to a prospective-capitated base.

Promote the development of home care as an alternative to institutional or nursing home care.

In any proposal the coordination of services under one program is an essential cornerstone.

With these goals in mind, I am proposing steps to fix the existing system and strike out in a new direction of providing community-based home health care. To that end I am proposing today the Senior Citizens Independent Community Care Act.

This legislation would amend title XVIII, medicare, of the Social Security Act to provide for a home health care program. It would assess the cost-effectiveness of prepaid capitation systems for providing acute and long-term care services for individuals aged 65 or older. It would provide home health services for elderly Americans in order to avoid unnecessary institutionalization, thus saving on the high costs of these facilities and promote the maximum functional independence of individuals. It would coordinate public and private programs serving the elderly through an assessment process that determines the eligibility and the appropriate level of care needed by individuals to keep them in their community and homes.

Besides the service currently provided by medicare, the bill would expand the scope of benefits to include homemaker-home health aid, adult day-care services, respite care services, service coordination to insure access and appropriate utilization without duplication, and individual assessment and treatment plans.

The program would be implemented initially in a maximum of four States. It would be open to all individuals who are entitled to medicare benefits under part A and enrolled under part B, who are age 65 or older, who reside in a State testing the program, and who have a defined level of physical or mental disability that requires help for a period of at least 6 months.

Preadmission assessment teams will evaluate each individual's health status, functional capabilities, home and family environment, in order to determine the type and frequency of services needed. Such evaluations will be conducted periodically to coordinate the optimum and appropriate utilization of services.

The payment of benefits will be based on a capitation method. The fixed per capita fee paid to each provider will be determined jointly by the Secretary of HHS and the participating State reflecting urban and rural differentials and adjusted to fit costs.

In addition, there would be a system of copayments by eligible individuals which would parallel the fees under part A or B for the same services. Those receiving homemaker-home health aid services, adult day services, and respite care services would pay a sliding fee indexed to their income.

The program would begin on January 1, 1984. The quality and utilization of services provided is to be monitored by the participating State, the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Comptroller General (GAO). Several reports have been requested to include recommendations for implementing the program on a national basis, suggested legislative changes necessary to insure effective implementation, and a detailed plan for such implementation. Finally, the bill provides funding from the Federal hospital insurance trust fund and the Federal supplementary medical insurance trust fund.

This bill promotes what I believe are essential features to a long-term care policy. Foremost it provides home health care to maintain an individual within his or her own family and community. Second, a capitation payment method is employed to provide incentives for alternative and innovative methods of health care delivery. The bill specifically targets the high risk elderly, those that need home services if they are to be kept out of nursing homes and functioning independently.

This legislation ties together acute and long-term care and asks providers to develop a coordinated approach to care of the elderly. Only by enlisting the medical community in addressing the problem of how to link long-term care with acute care and physician care will we achieve any meaningful solutions. This bill attempts to do just that.

During this past year, the medicaid program has undertaken some remarkable experiments in long-term care through its waiver authority. There are currently more than 40 such projects nationwide. Last year's TEFRA legislation provided limited home health services for those age 18 and or under. Because of newer developments in medicaid and disability programs, this initiative focuses on medicare where the magnitude and need for a coordinated program remains paramount.●

WOMEN'S EQUALITY DAY

HON. HAL DAUB

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to recognize Women's Equality Day on the 26th of this month, it is appropriate to note the significant advances that have been made by American women. From as nearby as the House of Representative's reading clerk's desk to as far away as outer space, formerly male bastions have given way to the driving competence and determined ability of American women.

Despite this important progress, economic inequities—for the homemaker as well as for those who work outside the home—continue to persist. The so-called feminization of poverty is not an empty phrase but rather a tragic reality, and it relates directly to women's jobs, wages, education, pensions, and social security. As a member of the House Select Committee on Aging, I held a field hearing in Omaha, Neb., last year that documented problems faced by older women. One participant's summary was noteworthy:

> The women of the United States have always carried the burden and the responsibility for nurturing families and communities. It is time that we, as a society, protect them financially so that the cost of their nurturing is not poverty.

Women's Equality Day should be a time to commend the achievements that have been made, but it must also be a time to commit ourselves to the unfinished agenda—financial security for the older woman, enforcement of title IX regulations governing equality in education, access to quality child and dependent care services, and a constitutional amendment that will guarantee equal rights under the law.

As the role of the American woman continues to evolve, their contributions to society will continue to expand to new fields of endeavor. Those contributions will be enhanced by a national commitment to equal oportunity, equal responsibility, and equal rights.●

INCENTIVES FOR NEW ENERGY TECHNOLOGIES

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Energy Development and Applications, which I chair, has recently held hearings on the effectiveness of existing tax incentives for promoting the development and utilization of new energy technologies. The subcommittee is considering the desirability of continuing those incentives beyond their current expiration dates.

During the 2 days, we heard various witnesses from the private sector on how these incentives are spurring development in new energy technologies, such as solar, thermal, biomass, synthetic fuels, low head hydroelectric, and others.

I was especially interested to learn of a breakthrough that could greatly increase electrical power production capacity in this country. The announcement concerning a major advance in a 50-year-old technology called thermocoupling was made at the July 21 hearing by Alan Magerman, president of Omnimax, Inc., a

Philadelphia research and development firm. He was accompanied by Dr. Harry A. Beale, director of research for Omnimax's subsidiary, U.S. Energy Resources, Inc.

The new development incorporates thin film deposition technology in the design of a thermocouple, making it for the first time an efficient generator of current. Incorporated in a thermoelectric generator, it would use otherwise wasted heat at electric power or other plants to produce electricity much more cheaply than current technologies.

This process could add 60.6 billion kilowatt hours per year to the Nation's steam generating electric powerplants. This is more electricity than the entire State of Georgia used last year.

As was stated at the hearing, a utility plant with turbine generators uses a fuel equivalent of 1,538 megawatts to produce 500 megawatts of electrical power for the consumer. The lost power is 1,038 megawatts. Of this, one-half is nonrecoverable because it is lost as heat through various inefficiencies. The remaining 519 megawatts is lost as waste heat. According to Dr. Beale, the new system is designed to recover at least 18.5 megawatts of this waste at the plant, which spends $350,000 to $400,000 in fuel costs alone to produce 1 megawatt.

Research and testing of the thermoelectric generator was made by U.S. Energy Resources with Battelle Memorial Institute, SRI International—formerly Stanford Research Institute—and Georgia Institute of Technology.

Using tax incentives, U.S. Energy Resources will build a prototype of the thermoelectric generator incorporating the advance within 12 to 15 months. According to Dr. Beale, the generator will have low-cost maintenance and low capital equipment investing cost. It can be easily retrofitted to existing equipment at a plant.

This is just the kind of research into new energy technologies that we must encourage, if the United States is ever to come near its goal of energy independence, as well as conserve as much as possible or our precious and limited natural resources.●

TRIBUTE TO VIC WERTZ

HON. DENNIS M. HERTEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, many baseball fans have seen the fabulous catch the Willie Mays made in the 1954 World Series. Not every fan knows that Vic Wertz hit that ball. Vic Wertz played for 17 years in the major leagues with six different teams. Vic always considered himself a Detroit Tiger, a team on which he played for 8 years. On July 7, 1983, his death was mourned. Vic Wertz died in Detroit, Mich., at the age of 58. He was born in 1925, in York, Pa.

Mr. Wertz started his baseball career in 1942 with Winston-Salem in the Piedmont League. In 1943 Wertz was sent to the Tiger's farm club, and 4 years later he was called up to play in the majors for Detroit.

Wertz was a productive hitter for the Tigers. His best seasons in a Tiger uniform, were the 1949 and 1950 seasons. During these years his batting average was over .300, with a combined total of 47 home runs and 256 RBI's. During the 1952 season he was traded to the St. Louis Browns and consequently played for three other teams: the Baltimore Orioles, the Cleveland Indians and the Boston Red Sox. In 1961 he was back in Detroit playing for the Tigers.

Toward the end of the 1955 season Vic Wertz was stricken with polio. Mr. Wertz recalls, "There were 5 days where I do not remember anything. When I came back to consciousness, my left leg was paralyzed. One morning, I woke up and my toes finally worked. After that, I hoped I could someday help to cure cancer or polio."

After his fight with polio in 1955, Vic Wertz decided to resume his baseball career. Ironically, that season in 1956 was one of this best seasons ever. He hit 33 home runs, the most for him in any season, and 106 RBI's. He was also named comeback player of the year. In 1963, Vic Wertz ended his baseball career with the Minnesota Twins.

Among the accomplishments of his successful career, Vic was a three-time all-star, appeared in one world series and set a major league record by hitting seven home runs, in five games. He is also a member of the Michigan Sports Hall of Fame.

Aside from baseball, Vic Wertz gave much of his time to charitable organizations. He hosted an annual golf tournment to help raise funds for the Girls and Boys Clubs of Metropolitan Detroit. He also sponsored a snowmobile race for the Special Olympics. The contributions generated by Vic Wertz were not limited to financial assistance—they went deeper than money—he gave his heart and himself to the people of Michigan.

Vic Wertz was also a successful businessman. In 1955, he bought a beer distributorship that grew into one of the State's largest.

People who knew Vic Wertz loved him. Cleveland Indian, Lou Boudreau, said, "Everybody who met Vic Wertz liked him, he was a great man." Vic Wertz will always be remembered as a tremendous baseball payer, a successful businessman and an extremely thoughtful person.

Vic Wertz is survived by his wife, Lucille, his two children, Terry and Patricia, a granddaughter and two sisters, Mrs. Dorothy Gibbs and Mrs. Doris Baker. All those who were affected by Vic Wertz's many contributions to baseball, charity, and people, are forever indebted to his devotion and love for the city and people of Detroit.●

ST. MARY'S HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATORS AND STAFF PRAISED FOR THEIR DEDICATION TO PROFESSIONALISM AND GOOD MANAGEMENT

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Chief of the Department of Health and Human Services in Washington recently stated: "Medical inflation just keeps pushing forward."

Few Americans who have sought medical care recently would quarrel with this statement, but it is important for us to note the exception and more important for us to consider why exceptions occur.

One obvious exception to the highly inflationary trend of medical costs is St. Mary's Hospital of Decatur, Ill., in the 20th Congressional District. Sister Ann Pitsenberger, the executive vice president of the hospital, recently announced that St. Mary's, through a total team commitment of monitoring costs, has been able to keep a lid on expenses at a time when most health care institutions are continuing to raise prices. The price freeze at this time keeps St. Mary's costs well below the State and national average.

Sister Ann noted several reasons why St. Mary's was able to hold down costs.

First on her list was a total commitment by the St. Mary's Hospital team to follow an austerity program. The hospital emphasized productivity, group purchasing, prudent personnel practices, and professional time management. Overhead expenses for energy were monitored closely and St. Mary's was able to draw on an active auxiliary of more than 500 junior and senior members who provided countless hours of volunteer service.

Mr. Speaker, it is especially important to keep in mind that St. Mary's Hospital is located in Decatur, Ill., which has had the dubious distinction in the past year of being a national leader in unemployment.

It takes a special commitment to maintain critical health services in a community which has been racked by a national recession.

St. Mary's Hospital in Decatur is more than a success story. It is an exception to the rule and an example for medical institutions across this Nation. I salute the administrators and staff of St. Mary's Hospital in Decatur for their dedication to professionalism and their proven record of good management.●

ETHNIC JOKES NOT A LAUGHING MATTER

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the condoning of racial and ethnic jokes has plunged to new depths. I note this as evidenced by the fact that books entitled. "Truly Tasteless Jokes"—volumes 1 and 2—are now firmly entrenched on the New York Times best sellers list.

These books are replete with racial and ethnic slurs and leave no group untouched. These specimens of literary denigration attack Poles, Jews, Italians, blacks, the handicapped, and the blind.

Even more amazing, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the publisher of these books maintains that "Truly Tasteless Jokes" are acceptable forms of American humor and bases his statement on the fact that they have received no complaints about these books.

Ethnic groups have few places to turn to express their concerns over negative stereotyping such as this. That is why I have authored the Ethnic Affairs Clearinghouse Broadcasting Act of 1983 which would establish a complaint bureau within the Federal Communication Commission to monitor such baseless attempts at ethnic humor which do nothing more than defame and denigrate—instead of educate.

My bill, H.R. 3105, would be a first-time attempt to systematically register complaints against negative programing by both radio and television networks. The bill also encourages the Federal Communications Commission to conduct conferences as well as encourage research which will explore this issue further. I believe that by better educating the public on these matters, that we can effectively sensitize those who make programing—and publishing decisions—that tasteless ethnic humor has no place in a civilized society.

The rise in popularity of books such as these can be largely attributed to a desire to shock. I believe that books such as these, which serve no positive role in building the moral fabric of our society, would hopefully drop in popularity because all Americans—including ethnics—recognize that such books are a dangerous influence on our young people. While we certainly cannot ban books—nor television or radio programs—we can insist on high standards of accuracy and fairness in print as well as in programing.

I believe that the Ethnic Affairs Clearinghouse Broadcasting Act of 1983 is a first step toward addressing this problem. It is not the only solution, nor perhaps the best approach. However, I offer H.R. 3105 as one approach to this issue and urge my colleagues support of it that we can work toward the elimination of derogatory and defamatory materials which reinforce negative ethnic stereotypes.●

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

HON. PHILIP R. SHARP

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, Dr. John Koumoulides, a professor of history at Ball State University in Muncie, Ind., has written a paper outlining his impressions of current U.S. foreign policy. I believe his thoughtful comments will be of interest to my colleagues. Dr. Koumoulides has also forwarded the remarks of Lord Hugh Caradon to the British House of Lords on the subject of Cyprus. Lord Caradon's speech follows Dr. Koumoulides' essay.

AMBIGUITIES OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

A. UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA

In dealing with Russia, perhaps with the best of intentions, the Reagan administration has, more often than not, sent mixed signals to the Soviets about whether we want peace or war. Relationship between Washington and Moscow has not been made clear or coherent by the administration. The administration is actively engaged in a war of words. The war of words is, alas, a contribution to diplomatic cacophony rather than progress. I do agree with what Lord Carrington, the former British Foreign Secretary, said in a recent speech, "the dehumanization of relations with the Soviet Union would be the quickest road to catastrophe." He went on to caution that, "The notion that we should face the Russians down in a silent war of nerves, broken only by bursts of megaphone diplomacy, is based on a misconception of our own values, of Soviet behavior and of the anxieties of our own people."

B. THE UNITED STATES AND GREECE

Allies do not threaten each other but approach their problems with understanding and respect for each other. In dealing with Greece Democratic and Republican administrations approached situations affecting relations between the two NATO partners on a post-World War II mentality and attitude, failing to recognize the many changes which have taken place in our respective societies. This is especially true and noticeable in Greece. The failure of the United States to recognize the changes which have taken place in Greece, changes in both the social and political sector of the country, contributed unfortunately to problems in the past and tensions in the present. We have not changed our priorities in Greece and even attitudes towards this region. A clear case in point here is our (US) insitence on the future of the United Air Force base at Hellenicon in Athens. Indeed informed Greek and American officials clearly do not see any sound justification or need for the presence of this base at its present location. As a former American Ambassador to Greece said "that base has been a source of problems and an obstacle to our relations with the Greeks and the image we portray in Greece." Yet in the current discussions over the future of the bases in Greece we give the impression that we continue to be sensitive about the Greek request to move the base from its present location. Previous administrations—Republican and Democrat—respected the seven to ten ratio on the matter of military assistance to Greece and Turkey, yet the present administration indicates a change in policy, ignoring the negative results such a change would have not only to our relations with Greece but our very own strategic interests in the region.

C. ON CENTRAL AMERICA

Here the United States has a long melancholy history of a reckless foreign policy. A record of support of authoritarian regimes and feudal social systems. We have supported, and continue to do so, military regimes, rather than invest in the area of social and economic justice. Social and economic progress contributes to political stability which helps establish the foundations of democracy. The people of Central America are in desperate need of social justice and human dignity, economic justice and political peace and harmony. Alas, America is not investing wisely and with the right forces in this vital region.

D. THE MIDDLE EAST

In this vital to our interests and peace region of the world the United States should continue the presence of the American peacekeeping force in Lebanon, and if necessary, increase it in order to guarantee peace in the region. The United States is perhaps the only power able to bring a just solution to the chronic problems of the Middle East. But Europe has an interest and a role in the region, and the Europeans should be asked to play a more active role and participate in the diplomatic efforts taking place in the area.

President Ronald Reagan on several occasions emphasized American commitment to justice and peace in the Middle East and other regions of the world. On 26 January 1983 in the "State of the Union Message to the Nation" the President said "Responsible members of the world community do not threaten or invade their neighbors and they restrain their allies from aggression." On 7 February 1983 President Reagan asserted that Israel was neglecting its "moral" obligation by not withdrawing its troops from Lebanon and thus becoming "an occupying force" there. Then on 18 April 1983 the President said "We remain committed to the recovery, by the Lebanese government, of full sovereignty throughout all of its territory. The people of Lebanon must be given the change to resume their efforts to lead a normal life free from violence without the presence of unauthorized foreign forces on their soil. And to this noble end I rededicate the efforts of the United States." Thus on all three occasions President Reagan eloquently stated the goals of the United States in the region not only of the Middle East but, I should think, other areas of the

world as well. Although the statements of the President are noble and eloquent, yet they are not equally applied in other situations such as the case of Cyprus. Ambiguities in policy and official statements sent confusing signals to both friends and foes. When it comes to the tragic case of Cyprus and American policy there our record supports both doubt and trust, and contributes to questions over sincerity of purpose and actual intentions and policy.

E. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To conclude my observations of American foreign policy and its implementation, I am convinced of the sincerity of President Ronald Reagan, and his predecessors, in trying to make important changes in American foreign policy and commitment to peace and justice. He is serious and should be taken seriously. His various statements should be followed by actions as proof of our sincerity. Here, I find myself in complete sympathy with Seneca, whose words will bear repetition in the context of the United States as a reminder to its leaders.

"Quod sentimus loquamur, quod loquimur sentiamus: concorded sermo cum vita." Epistolae, LXXV., 4.

"Let us mean what we say, and say what we mean: let our language and our life be in agreement."

[From the Parliamentary Debates, House of Lords Official Report, Apr. 20, 1983]

CYPRUS AND TURKEY

Lord CARADON. My Lords, I must declare a personal interest in this subject. It was on behalf of Her Majesty's Government that I signed the Treaty of Guarantee in Nicosia. Reference has just been made to that Treaty of Guarantee, guaranteeing the independence, territorial integrity and security of the new Republic of Cyprus, and going on to prohibit the partition of the island, indicting that if there was not agreement between the three Governments of the United Kingdom, Greece and Turkey, then, yes, one would act alone, but could act alone solely for the purpose of restoring the situation which was brought about by the treaty.

Having signed the treaty with the authority of Her Majesty's Government I have naturally watched subsequent events in the island of Cyprus with dismay and with shame that we should have given an undertaking and have failed so shamefully to carry it out. There is now the situation in the island, to which I have retuned once or twice, which is intolerable. It is a beautiful island cut in two. The people are unable to move from north to south or from south to north, and growing up—this distresses me most—is a new generation of people in Cyprus where one side does not know the other.

When I first went to Cyprus many years before, I knew that Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots lived and worked happily together in a hundred villages and in every main town. To go back, as I did in the middle of the EOKA rebellion, was to me a terrible experience, but I had the comfort and the satisfaction of remembering the days when the world was at war but Cyprus was at peace. As I have watched events in subsequent years since I signed the treaty, increasingly I have had a sense of shame—fury, it may be—that our country, with the responsibilities arising from 100 years of administration of the island, should not have taken the action which the treaty requires to search for and to find a peaceful solution.

Now we have a situation which is unbearable, with children growing up on each side of the line never even seeing anyone from the other side, and never learning each other's languages as they used to before. We have created, by our own inaction, and antipathy and an enmity which was not there before. That makes it increasingly difficult to find any possibility of a settlement and a solution.

We must turn for a new initiative. The opportunity may arise in the debate which is to take place early next month in the United Nations. We, with others, have been told for some time that there is nothing we can do because discussions are going on between the two communities. They have been going on for a long time, and it is clear that they cannot succeed. I read the press from both sides of the line in Cyprus, and it is one of the most disturbing and miserable experiences to read that there appears to be no possibility of the resumption of the friendship of the past. It is now a miserable and shameful state of affairs which has continued for far too long.

I do not think it is possible for us here to say exactly how the settlement should be worked out. It is necessary that the communal discussions should continue, but they should continue against a background of an international insistence that there must be a restoration of unity in the island. There has been some suggestion that people of international prestige might, either singly or as a group, discuss with both sides and come back to the United Nations to report. It is possible that a single representative of the United Nations might be given the task, as has been known in some other instances; someone of international reputation may make a contribution. Exactly how the initiative should be undertaken, not only by our nation but by all the countries of the United Nations there represented, is something that I hope our representatives to the United Nations will determine; and I hope that, with the maximum support from all those open to argument, we shall find a way to escape from the shameful consequences of our own inaction.

I should like to say a word on a wider issue. The new Secretary-General of the United Nations has been speaking, since he took over his duties last year, of the alarm—it is much more than alarm; it is fear—that the whole purposes of the United Nations are being destroyed largely by the failures of the principal members, the permanent members of the Security Council. He points out that they have special privileges under the charter and they surely have an absolute necessity to work together for agreement. That is what the charter provides. We have seen very little indication that there is any willingness in the United Nations of the principal permanent members to work together, even though that is their task. That is their sacred trust, as he called it, which is now being denied. Furthermore, he said that, where we do agree, surely there should be definite action to follow it up to make it effective.

Let us look at the examples that we had in our minds at this time—and, yes, it was more than 10 years ago that I signed the treaty. Look at the situation in Namibia, where, again, there has been a decade of delays since a United Nations decision. It was in 1967 when we had a unanimous resolution on the Middle East, on which no action has been taken. Now we are getting to a state of affairs in which, even when there are unanimous decisions—and it was unanimous on Cyprus, as it was on Namibia and the Middle East—we let a decade go by with no determination to make them effective.

The Secretary-General says, in words which are striking enough, the he fears that it may be that "we are close to a new international anarchy"—Those are his words—if we refuse to work together. The Security Council has spent a lot of its time engaged in abuse between East and West. They refuse to work together to try to find the answer to whatever the danger may be. Then, even when there is agreement, they refuse to do anything about it. This is a situation where people blame the United Nations. I hear slighting references to the Security Council and to the failures of the United Nations; but it is not the failures of the United Nations but the failures of the members, and, principally, of the permanent members, of the Security Council, who are engaged in mutual abuse rather than in the search for solutions.

We now have an opportunity in this country, because we had a special responsibility. We were in charge of Cyprus for 100 years, and we have long ties of, yes, friendship with both sides. In my own experience I like to think of the part which Foreign Minister Zorlu, or Turkey, and Foreign Minister Averof, of Greece, played. They were the people who made the agreement of 1960. What courage they showed, and what wisdom and energy! Would that we could see it again. I remember the scene in Nicosia that I referred to, when Bishop Makarios was on one side and Dr. Kutchuk, the leader of the Turks, was on the other, when we signed the treaty and looked forward to a happier, more prosperous Cyprus. I hope that that vision can be revived, and I hope that our country can play a leading part in bringing that about.●

H.R. 2490, THE CLEAN CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1983

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that election campaign spending and financing practices must be reformed if we intend to preserve democracy in the United States against special interests and the very rich.

My major concern about the Federal election process is the lack of any restraints on campaign spending. Since the Supreme Court in Buckley against Valeo has barred Congress from limiting either campaign spending by wealthy candidates or total campaign spending, we are faced today with an undemocratic anomaly: Rich candidates have the strongest incentive to pour literally millions of dollars into their own campaigns to buy a seat in Congress as if it were a seat on the stock exchange. Other candidates, meanwhile, are reduced to spending interminable amounts of time raising very modest contributions from individual donors and political action committees.

My opponent last year spent a record $1.7 million. Unless we take action now to curb this kind of spending, candidates of modest means will be discouraged from running, or will have to spend an inordinate amount of time attempting to raise the necessary funds to compete and the system will be perverted.

H.R. 2490, the Clean Campaign Act of 1983, attempts to cap campaign spending by providing voluntary public funds to candidates who agree to limit their expenditures. I warmly support this incenitve to hold campaign spending to reasonable levels.

But the second half of the basic problem—contributions by wealthy candidates to their own campaigns—is not addressed by H.R. 2490. In the light of this defect in the bill, the provision to limit aggregate PAC contributions to one candidate to $90,000 is too severe and counterproductive. A candidate faced by a rich opponent would be harmed by this provision. I favor amending the aggregate PAC limit to a more generous figure, possibly $150,000. Indeed, in the absence of an overall mandated cap on total campaign expenditures, I am unconvinced that any aggregate PAC limit is necessary.

The proponents of harsh restraints on PAC contributions are concerned about the undue influence of money and special interests on the processes of democracy. But PAC limitations cannot be viewed in isolation from a comprehensive reform of campaign spending and contribution laws. Unless and until we find a way to stop the rich from pouring vast amounts of money into their own campaigns, we should not make their job easier by increasing the burden of financing elections on their middle-income opponents.

Mr. Speaker, if H.R. 2490 comes to the floor for a vote, I will support it with an amendment drafted along the lines I have just suggested.●

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRIES

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, September 1 commemorates the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Alabama Department of Agriculture and Industries, and the Alabama delegation to the House joins with me in commending the employees and former employees of the department and the board of agriculture and industries.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the Alabama Department of Agriculture and Industries is an executive agency of the State of Alabama; and

Whereas, the Alabama Department of Agriculture and Industries is an integral part of the state government; and

Whereas, its establishment in the year 1883 makes this the centennial year for the department; and

Whereas, the department has had a major impact on the lives and incomes of the people of the state; and

Whereas, the gross farm income of Alabama is well over two billion dollars, making agriculture the state's number one industry; and

Whereas, the Alabama Department of Agriculture and Industries is primarily responsible for the promotion of agriculture and also acts as a regulatory agency that enforces hundreds of statute laws and regulations affecting all aspects of the agribusiness chain from producer to consumer; and

Whereas, the Alabama Department of Agriculture and Industries is the state's largest consumer protection agency; and

Whereas, we members of the United States House of Representatives take pride in the achievements of the Alabama Department of Agriculture and Industries; now therefore,

Be it resolved That we extend commendations and best wishes to the Alabama Department of Agriculture and Industries' employees and Commissioners, past and present, for their contributions to the achievements of Alabama Agriculture and Alabama Department of Agriculture and Industries over the past 100 years.●

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT CUTS DEALS WITH FAVORED FIRMS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would again like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the excesses of the Reagan administration.

The Department of the Interior is at it again. I do not believe that the Secretary of the Interior understands that the will of the American people is quite clear concerning their desire to protect the environment.

The history of this administration will be an extensive saga of favoritism for friends and the wealthy and degradation for the environment and the poor. I would like to comment to the attention of my colleagues the following articles written by Jack Anderson. It outlines only a small number of the actions of Mr. Watt which are suspect.

[From the Washington Post, June 5, 1983]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT CUTS DEALS WITH FAVORED FIRMS

(By Jack Anderson)

When Secretary James G. Watt staffed the Interior Department with industry executives, I promised to keep an eye out for any favoritism. Sad to say, my suspicions were not unfounded.

Interior officials have refrained scrupulously from taking part in decisions involving their former employers. But the department has cut deals with a select few companies that officials once worked for or invested in. My associates Jock Hatfield and John Dillon dug up a few examples from the agency's files:

Montana Power and Light and Amax Coal were the principal beneficiaries of the now famous Powder River coal sales in Wyoming. The General Accounting Office concluded that 1.6 billion tons of federally owned coal were sold for $100 million below fair market value.

As it happens, the two companies were generous contributors to the Mountain States Legal Foundation, which Watt headed until he came to Washington. The secretary did not excuse himself from the Powder River decision that was so profitable for his old foundation's benefactors.

Richard Mulberry, the Interior Department's inspector general, used to work at the accounting firm of Fox and Co. He still has $250,000 due him under the company's retirement plan. A few months after Mulberry joined Interior, Fox and Co. won a $387,525 contract from the inspector general's office.

Mulberry excused himself from the contract selection process, but the responsibility for reviewing the contract proposals was delegated to one of his subordinates—who must have known about his boss's connection with Fox. The accounting firm, which has been charged with fraudulent practices by the Securities and Exchange Commission, has seven more contract proposals pending with the department.

William Coldiron, the agency's solicitor, was director and vice chairman of the board at Montana Power and Light. When he came to Washington, the company paid him $108,881 in "severance, salary and vacation pay." Coldiron did excuse himself from participation in the controversial "fire sale" of Powder River coal leases to his old company.

James R. Harris, director of the Office of Surface Mining, had financial ties to Amax, the other big winner in the Powder River sale. He was once an investor in land deals with Amax and the Peabody Coal Co.

Harris said he knows "very little" about Interior's coal leasing policy; his office enforces strip mining regulations after the leases are awarded and the companies start work. He said he has never had any dealings with Amax "except as a buyer of property."

Footnote: The Interior Department "absolutely and unequivocally" denies any favoritism toward Montana Power, Amax or Fox and Co.●

DONATIONS OF EQUIPMENT TO NONPROFIT SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, today I am privileged to be joined by my colleagues, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. ROE, and Mr. RINALDO, in introducing legislation to make donations of newly manufactured equipment to nonprofit scientific research organizations eligible for

the special computation of the charitable contribution deduction for such property which was contained in the Economic Recovery Tax Act.

During consideration of the research and development portion of ERTA, Congress clearly recognized the important contributions of nonprofit scientific research organizations by making corporate grants for basic research performed by these organizations eligible for inclusion as qualifying expenditures in the new incremental research and development tax credit.

Some of the most important research work in the country is now underway at nonprofit research institutions. Many of them—the Salk Institute, Sloan-Kettering, the Mayo Clinic—enjoy international reputations for being in the vanguard of medical progress.

Today, there are more than 3,500 nonprofit institutes engaged in basic scientific research in the United States. I am especially proud of the Institute for Medical Research which is based in Camden, N.J. Its history of achievement is well known in the scientific community, yet its ability to continue its work is threatened by reductions in Federal funding, a problem shared by other research institutions.

I would like at this time to provide you with a brief history of the institute and its work which, I believe, will assist my colleagues in comprehending the need for the legislation being introduced today.

The Institute for Medical Research was founded in the early fifties by business leaders from the Camden area who wished to provide an independent facility for the pursuit of medical research. They had been inspired by the work of Dr. Lewis Coriell who, working in a converted linen closet at a local hospital, had developed the complex tissue culture techniques now used by scientists throughout the world.

The institute is renowned for its work in cell biology, cytogenetics, microbiology, virology, and immunology, as well as molecular biology. Today, its 100 researchers focus their efforts on furthering our understanding of the processes involved in cancer, aging, birth defects, and infection control.

Over the years, the institute has successfully competed for Federal grants and contracts with this funding accounting for 80 percent of its annual $3.5 million budget. The balance is derived from private contributions. However, the amount of Federal funds available to the institute and other research organizations has remained static over the past decade and additional support is uncertain in view of current budgetary constraints.

Some research institutes have managed to develop profitable alliances with major corporations. However, for a substantial number of research organizations, particularly those involved in basic research where there is little assurance of immediate commercial applications for their work, such lucrative arrangements are unlikely.

One obvious solution to this problem is to encourage additional support for these institutions from the private sector. Congress, as I indicated earlier, has demonstrated its support for these organizations by permitting corporate grants for basic research to these institutions to qualify for the incremental research and development tax credit.

As a further inducement, donations of scientific equipment should qualify for the charitable contribution deduction contained in ERTA. This incentive is badly needed. "The Annual Survey of Corporation Contributions for 1980," published by the Conference Board, shows that while corporate support for university research was 6.6 percent of all corporate contributions, nonuniversity research organizations received only 1.3 percent of such contributions.

I respectfully request that my colleagues join me in this modest effort to facilitate the continuation of the work done by nonprofit scientific research institutes.●

EULOGY FOR MRS. VESTER TUCKER

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I report to the House on the death of one of my district's outstanding public servants and citizens, Mrs. Vester Tucker.

Last month, Mrs. Tucker died at her home at the age of 76. For 32 years, from 1943 to 1975, Mrs. Tucker served as deputy circuit court clerk in Green County, Ky. For most of that period, she served under her husband, Rhea Tucker, who was circuit court clerk.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Green County came to know and love Vester Tucker as not only an outstanding public official, but also as a civic leader, and as a talented artist.

The Tuckers were also widely recognized in Kentucky for their excellent operation of their clerk's office. They were particularly noted for their efficiency, courtesy, and organization. Vester especially is remembered fondly for her diligence in helping people with geneological research.

As a devoted wife and coworker with her blind husband, as a civic leader in Green County, and as a friend, Vester Tucker left her mark on this world, and will be long remembered by those who admire hard work, public service, and a sense of community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the Congress to join me in sending our condolences to Mrs. Tucker's family, and in recognizing her outstanding contributions to society.●

AWARD GIVEN TO MRS. HOPE ADAMS

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that one my constituents, Mrs. Hope Adams of St. Marys County, Md., has been named the recipient of the Jane Gallagher Award. Mrs. Adams was recognized for her outstanding work with Catholic Charities on the behalf of the needy in our community.

The Jane Gallagher award is given annually to a laywoman who has selflessly devoted considerable time for the Catholic Charities. I wish to commend Mrs. Adams for her fine work and devotion to the uplifting of our less fortunate brothers and sisters.

I call my colleagues attention to the following article:

[From the Catholic Standard, July 28, 1983]

ST. MARY'S "SAMARITAN" IS HONORED

(By Anne Healey)

Hope Adams, grandmother, farm wife, part-time Catholic Charities worker and full-time good neighbor, will receive a national honor for her outstanding service to the needy in Southern Maryland.

Mrs. Adams, who has lived in St. Mary's County for all her 68 years, will be given the Jane Gallagher Award by the National Conference of Catholic Charities at its convention in Baltimore, October 6-11.

The award is named for a laywoman who worked for the National Conference of Catholic Charities from 1922 to 1976 and who was honored by Pope Paul VI with the "Pro Ecclesia et Pontifice" medal. The Jane Gallagher Award is given annually to a laywoman who has worked for Catholic Charities for at least ten years for service "above and beyond the call of duty."

Mrs. Adams began her professional work for Associated Catholic Charities in Leonardtown 13 years ago. Asked how she decided to go to work there, she told The Catholic Standard, "It chose me." She explained that when her sister, who had been working in the Leonardtown office, died suddenly, she was asked to take the part time job.

In nominating Mrs. Adams, Catholic Charities officials said: "Her official office hours are three days a week, but she is available seven days because she sees her work as meeting emergencies as they arise".

Mrs. Adams says as much herself, pointing out "I get as many calls here (at home) as at work." She said the phone starts ringing at her house at 8:30 a.m. when the state social service offices open. The social workers call her to take care of the people "who fall through the cracks" of the social service structure.

She finds food, clothes, heating fuel, rent money or whatever is needed. She also enlists the help of her whole family to deliver

furniture or food. Her son and son-in-law, after delivering furniture one hot Sunday afternoon, suggested that she share one of the privileges that goes with the award and have a family portrait hung in the Jane Gallagher Room of the NCCC here in Washington.

She said that the habit of charity has been part of her family for many years. Years ago, when her husband worked on the state highways, he often came across needy families and would bring them food (sometimes cooked by Mrs. Adams).

The list of her services to the needy of St. Mary's County provided by Catholic Charities when it nominated her for the award is three pages long. It elaborates on projects that range from visiting a disabled oysterman who injured his tonging arm when he slipped on ice aboard his skiff to sponsoring a benefit dance with the help of her son and his band.

Mrs. Adams also was cited for her work in the Hospice Movement, service on the board of the United Way of St. Mary's County, and work with many other charitable organizations.

Before coming to work for Catholic Charities, Mrs. Adams was a substitute teacher for the county public schools from 1964 to 1970. From the time of her marriage to Frank Adams in 1935 until 1964 she was a homemaker and helped out on the family farm.

She has four children and eight grandchildren, and is looking forward to turning her work over "to somebody younger". Still, she says "it's really easy to help people who really need help".●

GEORGIA GOOD SAMARITAN, JIMMY CARTER, HELPS SOUTH DAKOTANS

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, in looking through several newspapers from my home State this morning, and Associated Press story in the Lead of South Dakota Daily Call caught my eye.

It reflects the basic decency and compassion of the man who was our Nation's Chief Executive from 1977 until 1981. As President, Jimmy Carter set new standards of concern for human rights and world peace. As a former President, he continues to practice those principles of kindness in even the small encounters of everyday life.

I appreciate the thoughtfulness he showed to my South Dakota constituents during their Georgia vacation, and I commend the following article to the attention of my colleagues:

The article follows:

[From the Lead (S. Dak.) Daily Call, July 29, 1983]

BROOKINGS COUPLE MEET JIMMY CARTER WHILE VACATIONING

BROOKINGS, S. DAK. (AP).—Burton and Delores Brage got more than they expected when their car got stuck while they were vacationing.

It gave them the opportunity to meet former President Jimmy Carter, who helped the Brookings couple free their car in Plains, Ga.

The Brages were traveling through Georgia and decided to see Carter's hometown of Plains. Like other tourists, they drove past the Carters' secluded home and were looking for a way to turn around.

Brage pulled into a driveway down the road, but the car fell into a sharp drop-off as he backed up.

"I told Delores I was disgusted with myself and I had to get some help," said Brage, who recently retired as associate dean of the college of agriculture at South Dakota State University.

While her husband walked to town, Mrs. Brage got out, inspected the car and then sat under a tree. Several cars drove by before one stopped.

"I noticed the car stopped. I looked up and there were the Carters. I got up and shook their hands," she said.

Carter, clad in blue jeans, offered to go and get a cable to help pull the car out and checked the car to see if there was any damage, Mrs. Brage said.

Brage said he had a hard time believing his wife when she told him Carter was helping them.●

DISCHARGE PETITION FOR H.R. 618

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I am adding my signature today to discharge petition No. 3, which would bring the respect for human life bill (H.R. 618) out of the Judiciary Committee and onto the House floor. At the outset, I want to make it clear that I take this step with certain reservations, as I do not support this legislation in its present form.

I have consistently endorsed efforts to limit Federal funding of abortions, and commend the language of H.R. 618 toward this end. Nevertheless, I feel strongly that Federal monetary assistance for indigents seeking abortions should be permitted in three instances: Rape, incest, and when the mother's life would be endangered if the pregnancy were carried to term. Unfortunately, the respect for human life bill does not include all of these exceptions, and, therefore, I cannot support it as now stands.

With all this said, however, I believe the time has come for the full House to thoroughly and intelligently debate the merits of legislation of this sort. For years, initiatives seeking to limit governmental intervention with respect to abortion have been blocked by the House Judiciary Committee. The abortion issue is one that passionately concerns most of our constituents in one way or another. And the views of a few Members of this Chamber have precluded the possibility for the vast majority of us to express constituents' positions through a recorded vote.

We must provide an opportunity for the full House to examine the Federal funding of abortions once and for all, and to amend this present vehicle, H.R. 618, as we see fit. For this reason, my name has been included on discharge petition No. 3, and I sincerely hope the requisite 216 signatures can be achieved so that this vital issue can be debated in the appropriate forum.●

MEDICARE COVERAGE OF HEPATITIS-B VACCINE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill that would amend the medicare part B program to permit coverage of vaccinations for hepatitis B for medicare beneficiaries suffering from end stage renal disease. These medicare ESRD patients are at high risk of contacting hepatitis B because of the nature of the treatment of their condition.

This virus is transmitted primarily by contact with infected blood and blood products; thus the ESRD population is at high risk of infection. Any individual infected with hepatitis has the potential of becoming a chronic carrier of the virus and, thus, a source of infection. The carrier state develops in approximately 6 to 10 percent of patients with acute hepatitis. The cases of clinically significant hepatitis B infections which occur in dialysis patients may result in prolonged illness, expensive hospitalizations and, sometimes, death.

The Food and Drug Administration has recently licensed for general use a hepatitis vaccine, Heptabax-B. The vaccine is given intramuscularly at a cost of approximately $200 per vaccine regimen for renal patients. The vaccine is generally well tolerated with no major side affects reported.

Under current law, medicare does not cover vaccinations, with the exception of vaccine for pneumococcal pneumonia. This bill would allow coverage of hepatitis vaccine for medicare ESRD beneficiaries. I have been studying this issue for some time and believe based on evidence available to me that coverage of hepatitis B vaccine would be cost effective and would add to the quality of life of medicare beneficiaries suffering from end stage renal disease.

The Congressional Budget Office has recently released a cost estimate of covering hepatitis B vaccine for medicare beneficiaries suffering from end stage renal disease only. CBO projects a cost savings of $1.5 million over

the next 3 years. For purposes of this estimate, the CBO assumed that an immunization program would vaccinate all ESRD hemodialysis patients showing negative antigen and antibody screening results.

In July, I cosponsored a bill with Congressman WAXMAN which would provide coverage of hepatitis B vaccine for medicare beneficiaries in general. Although I support this bill in general I believe that the evidence currently available indicates that limiting coverage to ESRD patients would be cost effective at this time; thus, my bill would limit reimbursment to medicare beneficiaries suffering from end stage renal disease.●

ABA ADOPTS ANTIDISCRIMINATION RESOLUTION

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, August 2, 1983, an important step was taken to further the cause of equal rights in the country. At its annual meeting in Atlanta, the American Bar Association passed a resolution which endorsed the amendment to the Civil Rights Act to prohibit discrimination by private clubs and other establishments. Specifically targeted are those groups that derive a substantial part of their income from business sources.

I am particularly pleased and proud that this effort was led by Janet Studley, a young graduate of our University of Florida School of Law who is presently an associate with one of Florida's most respected law firms.

For the information of my colleagues, I am inserting into the RECORD a copy of the resolution.

Be it Resolved, That the American Bar Association endorses amendment to title ii of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §2000a (which prohibits discrimination in public accommodations on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin)[1] to:

(1) Include in the definition of the term "public accommodation" any private club or other establishment which derives a substantial portion of its income from business sources;

(2) Provide an adequate objective standard by which to measure "a substantial protion of income from business sources."●

[1] And which the House in 1980 urged be amended to also prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex.

INDEPENDENCE FOR NOAA

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, today the House Subcommittee on Oceanography of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is holding a hearing on H.R. 3381, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Organic Act. H.R. 3381 establishes the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) as the lead, independent, civilian oceans, coastal, and atmospheric agency of the Federal Government. It also creates a NOAA charter with the objective of codifying existing agency responsibilities.

I want to stress that the critical impetus for the introduction of H.R. 3381 was the administration's announcement of its proposal to abolish the Department of Commerce and create a new Department of International Trade and Industry. The trade initiative, which I support, was accompanied by an administration endorsement of the creation of NOAA as an independent agency. I urge my colleagues to join me in the long overdue effort to grant NOAA its independence.

I also would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial which enthusiastically supports an independent NOAA. It appeared in the July issue of Sea Technology.

The editorial follows:

ONCE MORE, WITH FERVOR INDEPENDENCE FOR NOAA!

(By Larry L. Booda)

Executive Reorganization Plan 4 of October 2, 1970 created the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), incorporating the former Environmental Science Services Administration (ESSA) and other entities.

NOAA grew from the seed of recommendations sowed by the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources, informally named the Stratton Commission for its chairman, Dr. Julius Stratton. The Commission was created by Public Law 89-454 of June 17, 1966. After three years of labor it produced the monumental four-volume report consisting of one main volume and three appendices produced by specialized panels, the whole titled "Our Nation and the Sea."

Of the Commission's many recommendations, with many still valid today, one stated, "The Commission recommends the creation of a major new civilian agency, which might be called the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency, to be the principal instrumentality within the Federal Government for administration of the Nation's civil marine and atmospheric programs." (Page 230, main volume.) Among other recommendations regarding NOAA, the Commission recommended that it be "established as an independent agency reporting directly to the president." (Page 233.) (For the complete narrative and recommendations on NOAA see pages 230 to 245. There are numerous other references to NOAA in the report.)

Ever since the Commission report story was published, this magazine, then named *Undersea Technology* (shortened in July, 1973), has pleaded for NOAA to become an independent agency. The first major mention was in an editorial in the January, 1972, issue titled "An Independent Ocean Agency." It said, "The National Oceanic and Atmoshperic Administration should be moved out of the Commerce Department—but more importantly, marine programs in 12 other government agencies should be put under NOAA."

Ever since we have stumped for the change, both in the magazine and in the Washington Letter of Oceanography. We had skirted giving way to despair at times, but still believed in NOAA's independence. No administration of either party seemed inclined to go along with the idea. There were too many empire building agencies that coveted NOAA.

Now, to our great surprise, the administration of President Ronald W. Reagan has taken the step, proposing to create an independent NOAA as part of a breakup and restructuring of the Department of Commerce into the Department of International Trade and Industry. (See page 9 for details.)

This magazine intends to pursue the goal with as much energy as it can muster until some legislation providing for NOAA's independent status is signed into law. At this writing key Senators and Representatives in oceanic and atmospheric matters had declared themselves solidly behind the proposal.

A free NOAA will have its work cut out for it. It has an excellent example to follow in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). That independent agency's organization and management are cited as a textbook case model of an efficient federal agency. It was created when NASA was organized in October, 1959. Its first administrator was James E. Webb. NOAA could do well to emulate the infant NASA of the early 1960s. Disregard NASA's present condition due to budget stringencies; the basic framework is still a model to follow.

NOAA's Administrator, Dr. John V. Byrne, took advantage of the reorganization announcement day to float the idea of declaring the year 1984 as The Year of the Oceans. We like that too; the two ideas go well together.

Now that the administration has acted, it is up to the ocean and air community to follow through, importuning members of Congress in every way possible. So, Once More, With Fervor, Independence for NOAA!●

LOCAL GOVERNMENT TAX ASSISTANCE ACT

HON. NORMAN SISISKY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to address a problem which affects the financial health of many local governments. At the present time, property taxes ac-

count for 78 percent of local tax collections. This is largely explained by the fact that local governments have no better tools for effectively generating sufficient revenues for providing public services. Yet the country's largest real property owner, the Federal Government, is exempt from property taxes for nearly all its holdings.

The Federal Government currently owns one-third of the Nation's land area: approximately 24,000 installations; 2.6 million square feet of floor area and numerous other structures and facilities. The best estimate available places the total value of U.S. real property at $280 billion. The public perception is that the bulk of federally owned property is largely open spaces represented by national parks, forest reserves, and growing timber lands. However, in reality, the bulk of the Government's property value—$210 billion of the $280 billion or 75 percent of the total—consists of buildings and structures located in nonopen space areas. If the Federal Government were subject to real property tax for its nonopen space property, that tax would be equal to about 6 percent of actual local property tax collected each year. More importantly, large areas of the Federal tax-exempt properties are within the boundaries of many of our Nation's cities, compounding their hardships as they seek new sources of revenues in today's hard-pressed economy.

As a result, I am introducing legislation to provide for payment in lieu of taxes to be made by the Federal Government to local government for real property exempt from local taxation. This includes all real property within the jurisdiction of the local taxing authority owned by the Federal Government, a foreign government or an international organization. My bill covers nonopen space areas only; that is, forest lands, parks, and other open space areas are excluded.

Let me make clear at the onset that there are not constitutional barriers to an equivalent payment in lieu of taxes. Although the Supreme Court ruled in 1918 that States could not tax the property of the Federal Government because it would be an interference of its soverignty, the Congress has granted exceptions to this immunity doctrine. Thus, all that is needed is the statutory consent of the Congress. And, such consent is possible.

We must never lose sight of the fact that the Federal Government enjoys the benefits of State/local government services. Moreover, the bulk of the services received are the same as for a private taxpayer. Local governments furnish police and fire protection, public health and sanitation facilities as well as a host of other services. Less obvious, but equally important, are the cost incurred by the local governments on behalf of the Federal Government—costs which for some communities are quite significant. For example, the local government may have to add capacity to its airports, highways, roads, and services; additional expenses for its public transportation system; or increase its social services budget to accommodate the Federal Government's installation or organization.

One of the most striking examples of this impact is the city of Portsmouth in my congressional district. In fact, this city has been cited in a recent study as one of three locations being most heavily impacted by Federal real property ownership. The assessed value of property in Portsmouth amounts to $3.5 billion; the Federal Government owns $1.8 billion or 51 percent of the total assessed value. I know of no other city in this country that is impacted with as much tax-exempt property. Compounding this problem is the fact that 63 percent of the 16,600 Federal employees working in Portsmouth, live in other cities. Therefore, the city does not share fully in the benefits of the payroll dollars. I believe that local governments such as Portsmouth, which because of their geographic locations, proximity to natural resources or climate, having substantial tax-exempt Federal property should receive payments for services provided. These payments are especially crucial in these difficult economic times.

I recognize that a bill requiring payments in lieu of taxes for all Federal real property is not economically feasible. I have therefore limited eligible Federal real property to nonopen space areas which have a substantial impact on the tax base of the local government unit in whose jurisdiction it lies. By substantial impact, I mean those local governments in whose jurisdiction entitlement property comprises 30 percent or more of their total assessed real property value and whose population is 10,000 or more. A portion of the total cost of this bill will be offset by transferring payments which would have been made by approximately 13 other acts. Also by consolidating the payments of these other acts, the administrative costs to the Federal Government for these programs will be reduced.

In summary, I support the concept that by acquiring real property, the Federal Government should assume some of the responsibilities borne by private taxable property owners. The Federal Government should make payments in lieu of taxes on much the same basis as owners of private property pay real estate taxes.

I submit section-by-section analysis of this bill and the full text of this legislation for printing in the RECORD following this statement.

The material follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SEC. 1—Purpose:

In 1819, the Supreme Court ruled that states could not tax the property of the Federal Government because it would be an interference of the sovereignty of the Federal Government. Congress has made discretionary use of the Immunity Doctrine, and, under special circumstances, has granted exceptions to the doctrine. This bill provides payments in lieu of taxes to eligible local governments for real property owned by the Federal Government, especially urban localities which are most heavily impacted by the loss of revenue. It covers "non-open" space areas; that is, forest lands, parks and other "open" areas, are excluded.

SEC. 2—Application for payment:

(a) Local eligible governments must submit applications for payment for each fiscal year.

(b) Specifies tax payment information to be provided to the GSA and a uniform method for determining real property valuation.

(c) Administrator must approve application prior to payment.

(d) Local governments can appeal application denials.

SEC. 3—Amount of payments:

Payments are restricted to funds appropriated, if funding is insufficient, applicant payments are ratably reduced.

SEC. 4—Relationship to other laws:

Amounts payable under this bill are reduced by the amount of payments paid under other laws with respect to which payments, in lieu of taxes, or contributions from revenue are made.

SEC. 5—Definitions:

(a) Designates the GSA as program administrator.

(b) Eligible local governments are defined as:

(1) Those whose jurisdiction entitlement property comprises 30 percent or more of the total assessed real property value, and

(2) whose population is 10,000 or more.

(c) Total assessed value is the sum of federal and nonfederal real property of the eligible local government.

(d) Local government means any county, parish, township, municipality or other political subdivision of a state which has taxing authority with respect to real property as determined by the Administrator.

H.R. 3843

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the Local Government Tax Assistance Act of 1983.

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress recognizes that, because of the location and character of much of the real property owned by the Federal Government, local governmental units are often deprived of substantial revenues which they would receive in real property taxes if such property were privately owned. The purpose of this Act is to correct this situation by providing for the making of fair and equitable payments by the Federal Government, in lieu of real property taxes, to such local governmental units.

APPLICATION FOR PAYMENTS

SEC. 2. (a) Subject to the availability of funds appropriated to carry out this Act, the Administrator shall make payments under section 3 for each fiscal year to each eligible unit of local government which sub-

mits an application under this section which is approved by the Administrator.

(b) Any eligible unit of local government desiring to receive payments under this Act for any fiscal year shall submit an application to the Administrator at such time and in such form as the Administrator may prescribe. Any application under this subsection shall include the following information:

(1) Identification of all entitlement property within the jurisdiction of the applicant.

(2) The value at which each property identified under paragraph (1) would be assessed if such property were subject to property taxation according to evaluation procedures determined by the Administrator.

(3) The tax rate which would be applicable to each property identified under paragraph (1) if such property were subject to property taxation.

(4) The amount of taxes that would be levied against each property identified under paragraph (1) if such property were subject to property taxation.

(5) The aggregate amount of tax revenue that would be available if the properties identified under paragraph (1) were subject to property taxation, as determined by calculating the sum of the amounts specified under paragraph (4) with respect to each property.

(6) Such other information as the Administrator may determine to be appropriate.

(c) In determining under subsection (b) the assessed value of entitlement property, the tax rate applicable for entitlement property, and the amount of taxes that would be levied against entitlement property if the property were subject to property taxation, the unit of local government shall treat the entitlement property in the same manner as all other property. No application may be approved under this section unless the Administrator has reviewed the application and determined that the information submitted by the unit of local government is accurate.

(d) No application submitted under this section by an eligible unit of local government may be disapproved by the Administrator unless the Administrator provides written notice to the unit of local government of his determination to disapprove the application, together with a statement of reasons for such determination. Any eligible unit of local government which receives such notice shall be granted a hearing on the record in accordance with section 554 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of appealing the disapproval upon submission to the Administrator, within the ninety-day period after receiving such notice, of a request for such hearing.

AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) The payment to be made by the Administrator to any eligible unit of local government whose application has been approved under section 2 shall be an amount equal to the amount specified in the application of the unit of local government under section 2(b)(5).

(b) If sums appropriated for purposes of making payments under this Act for any fiscal year are not sufficient to enable the payment of the amounts described under subsection (a) for all applications approved by the Administrator with respect to that fiscal year, the Administrator shall ratably reduce the amounts payable to units of local governments under this Act for such fiscal year.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS

SEC. 4. In the case of Federal real property with respect to which payments in lieu of taxes, or contributions from revenues, are made to States and local governmental units pursuant to any other Federal laws, the amount payable under this Act with respect to such property shall be reduced by the amount paid under such other law.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 5. For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) The term "entitlement property" means any of the following types of real property which are exempt under Federal law from the property taxation of the applicable unit of local government:

(A) Real property owned by a foreign government or by an international organization as defined in section 1 of the International Organization Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288).

(B) Real property owned by the United States, except "entitlement lands" as defined in section 6(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for certain payments to be made to local governments by the Secretary of the Interior based upon the amount of certain public lands within the boundaries of such locality" (31 U.S.C. 1606(a); 90 Stat. 2665).

(3) The term "unit of local government" means any county, municipality, parish, township, or other unit of general government which is a political subdivision of a State and is the provider of the government services for which real property taxes are assessed, and which has taxing authority with respect to real property as determined by the Administrator.

(4) The term "eligible unit of local government" means a unit of local government in whose jurisdiction entitlement property comprises 30 percent or more of the total assessed value of federal and nonfederal real property of that jurisdiction and whose population is 10,000 or more.

(5) The term "assessed value" means the property value—

(A) which is attributed to property by the unit of local government levying the property tax;

(B) to which the tax rate is applied for purposes of determining the total amount of property taxes to be levied with respect to the property involved; and

(C) which is to be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator.●

MAINTAINING AFFORDABLE TELEPHONE SERVICE

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, telephone service is a basic necessity just as food and shelter are. For many Americans, it is the only way that they can contract the fire department, the police, or emergency medical service. Unfortunately, if Congress does not act soon, telephone service might cost so much that some Americans will be forced to discontinue it.

Many telephone companies across the country are asking their State public utility commissions for large rate increases which, if granted, will lead to steep increases in the cost of basic telephone service. Moreover, the Federal Communications Commission's recent decision to levy on consumers a monthly access charge will affect the ability of many Americans to maintain basic telephone service in their homes. I believe that telephone service is a basic necessity and not a luxury. Every American should have this service available at a reasonable rate. However, if Congress does not take action soon to head off exhorbitant rate increases, many American might find basic telephone service priced beyond their reach.

In order to insure that telephone service is affordable, I am cosponsoring the Universal Telephone Service Preservation Act of 1983. I am convinced that this legislation will help to address the needs of my constituents in Southeastern Ohio who are concerned about maintaining basic telephone service in their homes at a reasonable price. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this vital legislation.●

HON. POWELL A. MOORE—IN APPRECIATION

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Powell A. Moore, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, will soon relinquish his present duties to return to private industry, and I want to take this opportunity to commend him for the outstanding service he has rendered both the administration and the Congress during his tenure in office.

Mr. Moore has had a varied and rewarding public career, which began in 1966 when he joined the staff of the late Senator Richard B. Russell from his native State of Georgia. Following the Senator's death in 1971, he became Deputy Director of Public Information for the U.S. Department of Justice and later served three Presidents in the Office of Legislative Affairs in the White House. Mr. Moore is also a veteran of three Presidential campaigns, and his practical political knowledge and experience has served him well in his current position as the State Department's top liaison officer with the Congress.

Powell Moore has been a pillar of strength as well as a symbol of reasonableness, cooperation, diplomacy, and tact in what I regard as one of the most difficult and demanding assignments our Government has to offer. Being a middleman between any administration and the Congress is a challenging task at best, but especially so, during this past year of height-

ened, and at times passionate, foreign policy debate. In carrying out his responsibilities, Powell Moore has done his utmost to develop a workable consensus between the two branches of Government—to the ultimate benefit of the Nation.

Above all, however, Powell has been a congenial colleague and friend, whose good humor and dry Georgian wit will be missed in the days ahead. On behalf of his many admirers on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I wish him every possible success in his future endeavors.●

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1983

● Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to my colleagues for supporting, and voting for, the designation of Martin Luther King's birthday as a national holiday.

Dr. King has been dead for 15 years. He is deeply missed. The designation of his birthday as a national holiday is an indication of the esteem in which he was held. The fact that Dr. King was black has made the struggle to honor him a cause which blacks have identified as their own. However, it is important to note that Dr. King was more than a black leader of black people. Dr. King was one more link in the chain of great leaders who have denounced violence and sought equality and reconciliation among people from different racial and ethnic groups and among people with very different points of view. As such, he was a great American leader in the finest traditions of this pluralistic society.

There are those who would cast the designation of Martin Luther King's birthday as a political sop to placate blacks in this country. They are dead wrong. All Americans who stand for peace, reconciliation, and good will toward their fellows rejoice today. Dr. King stood against divisiveness in a society which has known division. He stood for compassion and concern where hatred and neglect reared their ugly heads.

Every great American leader has fought for the ideals first set forth in 1776. The battles of the Revolutionary War and the Civil War were quite different than the battles of this century. Dr. King stands among our leaders who fought for peace and freedom. He was armed with a firm belief in God and the courage to fight ideas with gentleness. Our country would do well to continue to acknowledge leaders who share his beliefs and nonviolent methods. The designation of his birthday as a national holiday is a tribute to those beliefs.●

COVAULT HITS THE MARK

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing into the RECORD an excellent essay by Craig Covault, the space editor of Aviation Week & Space Technology. The essay is an unpublished version of remarks Covault made as a panelist at a recent National Aeronautics and Space Administration/American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics Symposium on Space Station.

In this article, Covault makes brutally clear that NASA must be much more aggressive in explaining its goals—and in particular the space station—to the White House, Congress, the media, and the public. He also urges NASA and others to look clearly at the current space efforts of the Soviet Union, and not talk about U.S. proposals in a vacuum.

For these and other reasons, I strongly recommend Covault's remarks to all of my colleagues and, in fact, to the entire U.S. aerospace community.

SPACE STATION STRATEGY AND ISSUES

(By Craig Covault)

It has been valuable devoting a whole week to the space station. Most of us have been so busy with shuttle over the past several years that it has been difficult to focus on the next U.S. goal in space.

Checking back I found the first large article I ever did on space shuttle (and by now we're up to about 300 on shuttle) was 13 years ago in 1970. It was an interview with Buzz Aldrin who was only a year back from the moon. Buzz was assigned to the space shuttle task force in Houston and I was working under a Reader's Digest grant.

Space shuttle then was at about the same point the station is now, a year or so away from formal program status.

The situation in the country was a lot different then compared to now, however. NASA budgets were going down, public interest in space was on the wane and the nation's attention was focused on Vietnam—even with these problems NASA was successful in obtaining shuttle program approval.

Now the situation is much different. NASA budgets are holding their own, the nation's economy shows improvement and public interest in space is up.

I cannot advise you on whether to build a space station or what type station to build. I can raise some questions that I think are important to your overall strategy, however.

Issue Number 1 is the question of leadership from the top—support from the President.

On all of the space shuttle missions President Reagan has taken time out to say something or do something in connection with the flight. Attending the Mission 4 landing is the best example.

Unfortunately, most of what he has said on the air-to-ground link with the crews has involved reminiscing about life on the ranch and how that compares to spaceflight—there has not been a lot of substance there.

This is an observation, not a criticism. The point is he has "been there" and that's an important and good sign.

I think if his advisors will let you, you can win the President on a station decision.

On the topic of advisors, the President's Science Advisor George Keyworth has been less enthusiastic, but his words have carried far more substance about quite appropriate concerns.

His message has been to make sure you've gotten your station act together and a plea that station activity not be the detriment of shuttle and spacelab utilization.

The President and Keyworth have to some extent given the impression the White House is going in two different directions-apparent pessimism versus apparent enthusiasm.

Now we are starting to hear a more upbeat approach by Dr. Keyworth with his comments on long term space goals.

I do not think you should jump to enthusiastic conclusions about this until pinning Dr. Keyworth down in more detail.

I do believe, however, the overall vibes from the White House indicate a GO for some sort of station or platform development.

All of us I believe would welcome long term U.S. space goals, but you should be careful not to let such goals dilute more near term objectives over the next 5 to 10 years.

NASA's station strategy has to date been quiet and conservatively paced. This is a technique Administrator James Beggs has used successfully to hold the line and even increase some recent agency budgets.

In the case of the station NASA has been concerned about getting ahead of the White House.

It's a question of strategy and appearance. The conservative approach toward modest new starts in the budget is one thing, a large new U.S. space goal like a station is another.

I'm beginning to believe you should be more out front and aggressive especially in explaining the multifaceted station elements you have in mind as compared to the old Skylab/Salyut approach.

NASA and the aerospace community have done extensive study to provide direct input for station justification. You have done your homework and now its time to state the case more clearly and more publicly.

Also, if NASA really believes a station is vital to sustain the agency's space development capability and that this is itself important to the nation—then it should not be so shy about saying so.

If you can state your case directly to the public I am sure they will support you. They are ready for a major new space goal with the shuttle as a stepping stone.

Look at the evidence: Up to 1 million travel to KSC for shuttle launches; several hundred thousand have driven to Edwards for landings; 780,000 called a special number to listen to the mission 6 crew and on Mission 7 that number grew to 840,000. During the orbiter Enterprise U.S./European tour 2.2 million people specifically traveled to the viewing sites, not counting many more who made some effort to view the city flyovers.

You have gotten the ball rolling, now you have to keep it going.

A view I hear often is that even with the best station user justification, the station decision will be a political decision.

If you start seeing support from the White House don't be so sure that it's because you have made a strong technical

case, but rather because the White House smells the political hay that can be made from the success of space shuttle and missions like Voyager, and Pioneer sailing out of the solar system.

In this regard an interesting area to watch will be the White House/OMB interaction in the station decision process.

I believe OMB is willing to approve some sort of NASA space platform development, but a relatively low level effort. This type of development would have little or no political clout. It would be a routine NASA new start, not a national space goal the White House could tout as a significant Presidential decision to push U.S. capability in space.

While on politics let me raise another issue.

If so many people think politics is going to be a significant station issue, then why is NASA so hesitant to raise the Soviet space program as an issue?

We are all in agreement the U.S. should not be doing a station development simply because the Soviets are, but NASA cannot ignore the big station push by the United States' prime competitor in the world.

I'm personally tired of going to hearings, or speeches or astronaut news conferences where someone asks a legitimate question about the Russian program with the NASA response superficial at best.

No one that I know of in NASA has said anything really strong about the Soviets since astronaut Tom Stafford unloaded on them in 1974 for the monkey business they were trying to pull in ASTP discussions.

In the current situation, I'm not talking about criticism. I'm talking about informing the public, Congress, a sizeable portion of DoD and the California lawyers in the White House about a Soviet space station development comparable to the U.S. Apollo program in expenditure and effort.

Let me remind you about what the Soviets have in development.

(1) A booster larger than the Saturn 5 moon rocket. They have totally revamped the design since failures with a similar class booster 15 years ago. I expect this one will work.

(2) Large space station elements for launch on top of this booster. Imagine the hardware they could place in orbit by flying this booster and payload only 2 to 3 times per year.

(3) A heavy space shuttle with an orbiter nearly identical in size to ours.

(4) A small winged spaceplane manned vehicle for launch on an expendable booster. They have already flown subscale versions.

(5) Continuing expansion of existing Salyut station capability with the Progress tanker and uprated Soyuz.

(6) A space station tug development that includes a large Gemini-size reentry vehicle to return station products to earth. The Soviet station tug now operational could transition into a Soviet teleoperator maneuvering system like that sought eventually for a U.S. station.

It is obvious the Soviets long ago established a large space station development goal and are now executing their plan. I believe they hope their station development will put them on the road for a manned Mars expedition in our lifetime.

There is also no doubt the Soviets already have leadership from the top on this station push.

Soviet Party Chairman Yuri Andropov in his first address to the Plenem (an equivalent to our State of the Union Message) specifically endorsed establishment of permanently manned Soviet space facilities.

Soviet periodicals repeatedly state the Soviet goal of "Sovyetski Gorod"—A Soviet city in space. They call it Cosmograd and with the developments just cited it's clear they have the foundation laid for such manned space facilities.

In short, it's time for NASA to pull its head out of the sand on the Soviets.

The agency's public affairs office is totally unequipped to handle the simplest queries on Soviet space flight—and the agency's managers have been ducking the chance to comment.

The Soviet program is an issue because their space station push is part of their military, technology and international strategy—not because it would make a convenient tactic for U.S. station approval.

Were NASA to raise this more visibly the Soviet program might get more media and public attention. I can offer one example. About three years ago, Omni Magazine asked me to write an article on the Soviet space program.

I did not put a lot of work in to it, and it was just a compilation of old Aviation Week findings, but the reader response at Omni to this thing was tremendous—I believe the second largest reader response they had had to date. The typical comment to Omni was, "I had no idea."

I would like to say a few more words on the media because the media is very important to your space station kickoff.

Just as you consider your approach to the White House on the station issue, you should also consider your approach to the media—or make sure the White House does when it discusses the space station.

That sounds simple, but I will cite two cases where the space community and the White House blew it.

The first is the Reagan space policy released July 4, 1982, in connection with the shuttle Mission 4 landing.

There was an almost universal perception in the media that this was a military space statement, not the national policy it was designed to be. Media coverage of the policy failed to convey the policy's objective of maintaining U.S. space leadership both civil and military. The civil side was ignored as was the importance of language allowing consideration of station facilities.

Why?

First, the White House was uncooperative in discussing for background the policy prior to its release. If they had not treated it like a big secret they could have laid some valuable groundwork in explaining their objectives.

Secondly, the President's speech at Edwards was not particularly hard-hitting.

Finally, the White House backgrounder held when the policy finally was released was a group grope on relatively short notice. Since all the journalists that normally cover spaceflight were out of town covering a spaceflight, the background was to a group of media who had little savvy on the space program. The results were predictable.

Another example of where the White House message got lost was President Reagan's so called Star Wars speech.

The fact it drew the Star Wars label indicated media misunderstanding of the message that was directed more at overall defensive technology than space warfare. The White House approach with the defensive technologies speech suffered from some of the same problems that affected the space policy speech and the result was wide spread nay-saying in the media.

If a space station announcement runs into similar problems, you've got trouble.

So what can you do to prevent it?

First of all, I think you are always better off saying more, rather than less, early in the game. The media by and large is not very savvy on technology in general, let alone spaceflight specifically. You have to explain this stuff frequently for it to soak in, especially when it comes to the multi element space station concepts now under planning.

As for worrying about "getting ahead of the White House," how often have you heard the comment about the man in the street already being way ahead of the bureaucracy when it comes to caring for the U.S. space program.

Another thing you can do is insist when the White House has something to say on space, that the statement carry sharp substance—not generalities. After all, you are the space experts, not the White House.

A third measure would be to strive for NASA public affairs offices with a more aggressive attitude. They need a stronger understanding of space flight hardware, operating procedures and what it takes to convey that to the media.

A final thing you could do is bring the younger participants in NASA and industry out to do more of the explaining. An example is the group of new astronauts brought into NASA in 1978 and 1980.

They are as sharp and enthusiastic a crowd as you will ever find. Of course they are already busy—but I think they could be turned loose more to explain what's going on in both the U.S. and Soviet space programs. They represent action, results and adventure—not bureaucracy.

Another problem is the media itself. Much reporting on technology and especially space flight reporting is filled with serious errors. The emphasis is on show biz and superficiality.

I'm not talking about the "correction box" type errors here. We all make those and always will. I'm talking about some really poor explanations of space flight being conveyed to the American public.

Some examples—The Washington Times here a few months ago carried a large article about NASA having an offensive space shuttle capability based on a supposed astronaut manned maneuvering unit ability to kill 12 Russian satellites in a 7 day mission. The same guy that wrote that gem followed it up a few weeks later with a big article about how NASA Administrator Jim Beggs has assigned himself to fly on the space shuttle.

We laugh at this stuff, but the paper was serious. A lot of people probably believed that nonsense, and when the first manned maneuvering flights are made you can bet the Soviets will use the Washington Times' inaccuracy as propaganda.

Turning to shuttle Mission 7, wouldn't you agree that most of the stuff written about Sally Ride was pure drivel. Of course it was historic, but the media's show biz hype was ridiculous. I think Ride's experience also showed a pretty shallow understanding in the media about what a shuttle crew actually does in both preparing for a mission then flying it.

Another Mission 7 example: NBC routinely called the space shuttle a capsule. That really is an insult.

Then there was Newsweek's large drawing supposedly showing how the Mission 7 crew heroically led by Sally Ride—was going to deploy the German SPAs pallet satellite. Unfortunately, Newsweek's drawing actually showed deployment of the shipping crate

used on the ground to haul the SPAs around in. It looked like this giant coffin going overboard—Newsweek did not know the difference between the crate and the actual spacecraft.

It's bad enough that the writers make such errors. What's just as bad is the editors that oversee the writers don't know any better either.

In addition to these errors, I know the media has not adequately conveyed the adventure of space flight on the shuttle and the marvel of this spaceship to the public—remember NBC's capsule description. I know that adventure is there, I've seen it in the simulators dozens of times.

You need to convey to the public the adventure side of future space station operations as well as the technological side. A great place to start would be the extraordinarily deep space observations that could be made with large observatory structures built in orbit with space station support. The discoveries we expect from Space Telescope are just the beginning of what you could do in our lifetime with station based astronomy and astrophysical observations.

Most members of the media and NASA public affairs believe they have to be superficial in explaining space flight lest the public not understand.

I don't believe the public is given enough credit for its ability to understand space flight in general and specifically what's going on in individual programs like shuttle.

My experience has been when you give them more accurate detail and less show business, they appreciate it. It simulates their interest.

I think if you can find a way to push and stimulate that extra accuracy and detail that's lacking, you will make the public feel more a part of the space adventure and secure an even stronger base of support for a new national goal such as a space station.●

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. JIM BATES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, at this time of escalated U.S. military presence in Central America, it is essential that Congress emphasize nonmilitary policy alternatives in the struggle to restore stability to the region.

I recently met in San Diego with my district subcommittee on Central America. At that meeting an eight-point policy recommendation was drafted that includes practical alternatives to our current program of armed intervention in El Salvador and throughout Central America. I ask my colleagues to give careful consideration to that subcommittee's eight-point recommendation which I now submit to the RECORD:

1. Recognition of the right to and need for self-determination of the people of Central America;

(a) Guarantee of basic human rights and freedoms reflected in the United Nations Statement on Human Rights;

(b) Redistribution of land and equal access to basic human services (education, medical, etc.);

(c) Right to organize free labor unions and other associations;

(d) Release of political prisoners; and

(e) Participatory, civil government.

2. Immediate cut off of all military aid (direct or indirect) to the government of El Salvador. The present "recertification" process is unacceptable in that it has failed to substantially reduce human rights violations. Denial of continued meaningless "recertification" in absence of objective evidence of significantly improved human rights conditions.

3. Active support for a political solution to the crisis in El Salvador. A call for the government of El Salvador to begin direct negotiations with the opposition forces (FDR/FMLM) to work toward a cease-fire and a plan for representative civil government.

4. Support for the recognition of elections, only if truly "free," i.e.:

(a) Guarantee safety for those organizing political parties, campaigning and running for office;

(b) Access to all citizens to secret ballot vote without intimidation; and

(c) Supervision and monitoring of campaigning and election process by the United Nations.

5. Immediate cessation of military or other support of those forces working to destabilize and/or overthrow that government of Nicaragua. Support for dialogue between Nicaragua and the United Nations.

6. Cessation of the increasing militarization of Central America and the consequent spreading of violence and conflict throughout the region (especially in Honduras).

7. Opposition to any renewal of military aid to the government of Guatemala.

8. Support for governments that meet the conditions of self-determination and human rights practices as outlined in number 1 above.●

TRIBUTE TO SOLEDAD T. HERNANDEZ

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, today I want to bring to your attention the triumphs and the tragedy of one of South Texas' most distinguished citizens, Mrs. Soledad T. Hernandez.

Few individuals have the strength and stamina that this 81-year-old American has displayed to her community. She arrived in the United States from Mexico on August 1, 1924. Her activities since that date are an inspiration to all who believe in the freedoms and opportunities of this country.

At a time when Hispanic heritage caused an additional burden to arrivals in the United States, Mrs. Hernandez actively worked to register voters so that all persons, regardless of race, could participate in our government. She has never forgotten her heritage and has worked in numerous civic organizations to help all Americans understand the cultural importance and pride of the Hispanic community. Yet she has never ignored the needs of the United States, always working to improve her city and Nation.

Sadly, Mrs. Hernandez' house burned to the ground in February of this year. A widow of 35 years, she has been unable to rebuild her home because of a lack of funds. Yet the community she served for so long has not forgotten her. Efforts are underway to raise money so that Mrs. Hernandez may once again have a home of her own. I would like to salute these efforts and the person for whom they are undertaken. This loving response to a senior citizen who has served her community and country for the past 59 years is an act in which we can all take pride.●

CAPTAIN SHUMARD DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT RETIRES FROM THE CYPRESS POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, 1983, a very dedicated Cypress police officer was honored by his family, friends, and many appreciative citizens for his loyal service to the community. He was honored on the occasion of his retirement. I know my colleagues in the House want to join with me in honoring this man.

Capt. Jerry M. Shumard is a 23-year veteran of the Cypress Police Department, where he was first employed as a police officer on June 10, 1960. In January of 1965, he was promoted to sergeant, and 4 years later Jerry Shumard was promoted to lieutenant. In September 1972, Jerry was promoted to police captain.

Captain Shumard has had a very distinguished police career. He has worked every detail within the police function, and commanded each division of the department. In addition to the many commendations he has received for outstanding work, Captain Shumard has attended numerous specialty and management schools. His educational background includes an associate of arts degree from Fullerton Junior College, and the intermediate supervisory, and advanced certificates from the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training.

Captain Shumard's present duties include being the city's coordinator for emergency services. His efforts in preparing the city's disaster plan have resulted in a program model for other communities. He has been involved in many community activities over the years. However, his most notable role is that of Cypress' official Santa Claus. In that role, he has brought joy

and happiness to the lives of many people in the Cypress community.

Captain Shumard is a 20-year resident of Cypress. His successful police career could only have resulted from the support he has received for the least 30 years from his wife, Marilyn. The Shumards have one daughter, Paula, who is a recent graduate of California State University, Long Beach.

Jerry will be greatly missed in the day-to-day operations of the department, but I trust Cypress has a lifelong friend. We wish you well in your new endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, the contributions of Captain Shumard to the security, safety, and betterment of the Cypress community can never be fully recognized. I know my colleagues in the House wish to join with the many Cypress citizens in wishing this man every success as he begins a new phase in his life.●

A FOREIGN ENTANGLEMENT IN CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. JIM BATES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, with the passage of H.R. 2760, the Boland-Zablocki amendment to the Intelligence Act of 1983, the House of Representatives sent a strong message to the White House that we oppose the further entanglement of the United States in the Central American morass. This past week, however, President Reagan appeared more determined than ever to pursue his own policy in the region.

Clearly, the President's most recent efforts to escalate U.S. involvement in Central America underscore his intent from Margaret Thatcher and hoping for an equally productive outcome to the one in the Falklands, the President is now willing to send 5,000 troops on military maneuvers in Honduras.

The American people and this Congress cannot stand by while he perfects his Thatcher imitation.

The problems of Central America are regional issues, political and economic issues. They demand regional solutions with full participation by all those involved. U.S. carrier battle groups have little place in the negotiations.

The Sandinista regime is now willing to cooperate with the Contadora group and other Central American nations to restore stability to the region. We should enthusiastically support their efforts, rather than attempt to intimidate the Government of Nicaragua by escalating our involvement.

Fortunately for Great Britain, Margaret Thatcher never had to cope with a Vietnam in the Falklands. We may not be so lucky in Central America.●

INTERNATIONAL RECOVERY AND FINANCIAL STABILITY ACT

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, the following colloquy was intended during the debate of the IMF bill. Unfortunately, time was restricted and Mr. Marriott and I did not get the proper time for the following colloquy:

Mr. MARRIOTT. Since the gentlewoman from Ohio serves on the House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee, I wonder if she would shed some light on this issue for my colleagues. It has been suggested that section 409 will "intensify Government control over banking institutions and loan evaluation procedures" and "impose excessive Government intrusion into banking management." Is this so?

Ms. OAKAR. Absolutely not. Section 409 was drafted specifically and carefully to avoid governmental intrusion into or Government control over banks or their loan evaluations since:

The economic evaluation required under section 409 is left entirely to the discretion of the lending bank, which is then solely responsible to itself for the assumptions used to support the report's conclusions and for the conclusions themselves.

The provision specifies an absolute minimal amount of Federal overview. Federal auditors, in the normal course of their audit procedures, would check to insure that the economic feasibility study required by section 409 has been completed and is retained in the bank's files.

In fact, the principal objection I have heard concerning section 409 is that it is too lenient and that there should be additional governmental controls imposed and regulatory standards specified.

Mr. MARRIOTT. If the gentlewoman would yield further, I would like to ask her opinion on the assertion that section 409 "discourages the free flow of U.S. capital and exports."

Ms. OAKAR. That is an unfounded assertion. The only conceivable way section 409 could discourage the outflow of U.S. capital and exports is that various inherently uneconomic foreign projects might be rejected by the banks after the banks have reviewed in more detail the anticipated economic viability of these projects. When that happens, there will be other foreign projects to take their place.

Mr. MARRIOTT. If the gentlewoman would yield, I gather that you believe that substituted projects will also have real needs for financing, and will by their nature be more worthy recipients of financing from the U.S. than uneconomic projects. Since there are generally more projects than there is capital, there will probably be little, if any, significant dampening impact on the outflow of U.S. exports and capital.

Ms. OAKAR. Exactly.

Mr. MARRIOTT. That makes a great deal of sense to me. In my considered opinion, the United States should not be encouraging the free outflow of capital if the net result is to increase the deterioration of U.S. productive capacity of vital commodities and to increase U.S. unemployment. I can see that section 409 is precisely the kind of safeguard we need. It seems to be a very measured measure.

Ms. OAKAR. The gentleman is correct. The unemployment situation that exists currently in our country has reached the point where some measured corrective actions are now appropriate and necessary. We can't just sit here and watch all these jobs being shipped abroad. Section 409 is designed to be a step in that direction. We don't need draconian measures, but we surely do need to send these banks a message.

Mr. MARRIOTT. If the gentlewoman from Ohio would yield further, in your view, does section 409 discriminate against foreign loans or create any real risk of retaliation by any foreign government?

Ms. OAKAR. No, on both counts. Section 409 is designed to focus attention on the fact that foreign project loan requests already have an overwhelming advantage over competing loan requests from U.S. borrowers because the foreign projects typically enjoy foreign government guarantees and subsidies, backed by a lender of last resort—the IMF. U.S. borrowers are not so fortunate. Section 409, in and of itself, will not correct this imbalance but it will be helpful in precluding foreign project loans which are inherently uneconomic and should never go forward.

Rest assured, there is little or no risk of retaliation. Foreign projects that are ultimately rejected by the lending banks under the language of section 409 clearly deserve to be denied financing. The affected host countries will be much better off without such projects and well advised to seek financing for other inherently economic projects. Section 409 merely encourages sound, economically viable foreign projects.

Mr. MARRIOTT. That's how it ought to be. In other words, section 409 will put foreign project lending on the same economic basis as is required for unsubsidized domestic lending. Uneconomic project lending is harmful to the host country, the IMF, the United States, U.S. industries, and U.S. workers. Is it also true that a comparable provision to section 409 was included in the final Senate IMF bill?

I thank the gentlewoman for this information. I know that she serves on the House Banking Committee and has been directly involved with the detailed discussions on IMF funding. It is clear to me that this amendment is pro-U.S. industry, pro-U.S. jobs, pro-competition.

Ms. OAKAR. The gentleman from Utah is correct. This is indeed a jobs amendment. The Senate did include a similar provision in their final IMF bill.

Mr. MARRIOTT. Well, I'm convinced—I urge my colleagues to join with me in preserving section 409.●

FTC SUPPORTS HEALTH CARE PROPOSAL TO PROMOTE PREFERRED PROVIDER ORGANIZATIONS

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues some

good news I received last week from the Federal Trade Commission regarding a goal shared by every member of this body. That goal is quality and accessible medical care for Americans at affordable prices.

Few issues have been more widely debated in Congress in recent years than this one. Workers are finding that their pay increases melt in the form of ever increasing cost for health care premiums. Employers understand that the rising cost of health care is the fastest growing expense to American business today.

Some contend that the only way we can control these costs is through a massive new scheme of Federal regulation. I happen to believe there are a number of steps we can take to insure access to quality, affordable health care for Americans without constructing a new pyramid of Federal regulation.

That is why earlier this year I introduced legislation to promote the development of an innovative new cost-saving proposal called preferred provider organizations, PPO. I am delighted to report that last week, in a letter to me, the FTC indicated support for my legislation.

In is letter to me, Chairman Miller indicates that this legislation will help promote competition in the health care marketplace and enhance consumer welfare. In addition, Chairman Miller states that this legislation will help insure that preferred provider organizations developed free of unnecessary restrictions.

Under a PPO arrangement, doctors and hospitals agree with insurers, employers, unions, or other purchasers to lower their prices for health care services. In return, the doctors and hospitals are guaranteed a substantial number of patients and prompt payment.

Unlike many other group plans patients who participate in a PPO may see any doctor they choose and health care providers are paid on a fee-for-service basis.

My bill would override State, laws which restrict PPO development. It also establishes the PPO's can be lawfully negotiated. This will serve to eliminate uncertainty about the legality of such negotiations that has developed due to several recent court actions. My legislation would in no way change existing Federal and State antitrust laws. Chairman Miller did however recommend minor modifications to further clarify this point.

Preferred provider organizations are springing up in response to the public's demand for quality medical care at affordable prices. The commission's support of my legislation will help catalyze congressional action that will give all Americans access to these innovative, cost-containing health care plans.

Although PPO's are relatively new, they have already produced impressive results. In California, Blue Cross has established a preferred provider arrangement called a Prudent Buyer Plan, covering the six population centers of the State that has lowered hospital insurance premiums 15 percent. This plan not only offers the same quality benefits as other Blue Cross arrangements but adds additional benefits such as well-baby care and coverage for preventive services such as pap smears.

Even though hospital costs rose 24 percent in California between July 1982 and July 1983, the negotiation of these prudent buyer plans indicates that something can be done to counter the health care cost spiral which continues to rise.

In Minnesota, another plan covering most hospitals in the Minneapolis area will save subscribers $10 million in hospital costs this year.

Mr. Speaker, I think these results demonstrate that we can reign in health care costs without creating a Federal regulatory monster.

We can offer a new, affordable option on the health care horizon and can do so without restrictive and burdensome Federal regulation.

I am glad that the FTC shares my views and I thank Chairman Miller and the other commissioners for considering my legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1983.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
Longworth Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WYDEN: Thank you for requesting the views of the Federal Trade Commission on H.R. 2956, which you have introduced to exempt preferred provider organizations from the coverage of certain state laws and regulations.

As you know, the Commission is very interested in the development of alternative health care systems because they offer substantial benefits to consumers by promoting cost-containment and stimulating competition in the health care industry. In recent years, the Commission has taken a number of steps to encourage the provision of such services.

For example, in 1981, the Commission issued an enforcement policy statement designed to outline the manner in which physicians can collectively participate in medical prepayment plans without violating the antitrust laws.[1] More recently, the Commission issued an advisory opinion to Health Care Management Associates ("HCMA") concerning a preferred provider program in which HCMA proposed to serve as an intermediary between participating physicians and third-party payors such as insurance companies. The Commission concluded that such a program would likely improve competition in the health care sector and would not violate the Federal Trade Commission Act or any other antitrust statute.[2] Policy statements such as these are intended to encourage the development of alternative health care systems by delineating the organizational provisions that most clearly comply with the antitrust laws. System organizers that rely exclusively on these provisions can then offer their services without fear of Commission action.

Preferred provider programs are a relatively recent innovation in the health care field. Under such plans, third-party payors contract with health care providers—either directly or through an intermediary—to furnish services at less than their usual fees in exchange for guaranteed prompt payment and preferential access to patients in the program. In order to make such programs work, organizers must be able to negotiate contracts calling for alternative rates of payment with health care providers in a variety of specialties in a given geographic area. Moreover, organizers need to be able to encourage plan members to consult the preferred providers under contract by limiting reimbursement for health care services to the amounts charged by the preferred providers. However, existing state laws and regulations may limit the degree to which preferred provider plan organizers can negotiate and implement contractual provisions of this sort. H.R. 2956 would help in this regard by minimizing the extent to which state laws may unintentionally or unnecessarily hinder the development of alternative health care systems. In particular, the legislation would expressly permit group health payors to reimburse physicians and beneficiaries at alternative rates.

We recognize, of course, that states have an important and legitimate interest in protecting the health and safety of the public. Under the proposed legislation, they would retain the authority to enact laws or regulations for that purpose. However, we presently are not aware of any persuasive justification of this nature for the state statutes that currently appear to hinder or prevent development of alternative health care systems. In fact, most or all of these statutes predate programs such as preferred provider organizations and their restrictive effects upon these alternative health care systems very likely were not intended or anticipated.

In order to ensure that preferred provider programs remain subject to effective antitrust review and enforcement, however, the commission recommends two modifications relating to Section 2(a) of H.R. 2956. First, we suggest insertion of the word "state" between the words "other" and "law" in line 6, in order to make it completely clear that the bill would not exempt the covered programs from the federal antitrust laws. Second, we recommend that Section 2(a) be modified so that state antitrust laws continue to apply to the covered programs. As one step in that direction, we sugggest replacing the phrase "one or more group health plan payors" in lines 6 and 7 with the phrase "any group health plan payor". Agreements

[1] Enforcement Policy With Respect to Physician Agreements to Control Medical Prepayment Plans (Sept. 25, 1981).

[2] "Health Care Management Associates: File No. 833 0005" (Advisory Opinion) (June 8, 1983), at 4. In reaching this conclusion, the Commission noted that, under the terms of the proposal, health care providers and third-party payors who participate in the program will remain free to participate in other programs as well; the program will not involve any agreement among competing providers or third-party payors concerning any aspect of its operation; and no actively practicing provider, hospital, or third-party payor will have any financial or other interest in the program. Id.

among payors are not typically essential to the success of preferred provider programs, and making this change would help to ensure that such agreements would continue to be subject to state as well as federal antitrust statutes.

The Commission concludes that H.R. 2956 would help ensure that alternative health care systems such as preferred provider organizations can develop free of unnecessary restrictions. This, in turn, should increase competition and consumer welfare in the health care sector. With the minor modifications noted above, we support enactment of this legislation.

By direction of the Commission.

JAMES C. MILLER III,
Chairman.●

VFW SUPPORTS PRESIDENT ON CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. ELDON RUDD

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I was heartened to learn of last week's wholehearted endorsement of the President's Central American policies by the national commander-in-chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Commander-in-Chief James R. Currieo, who ably represents the 2½ million men and women of the VFW and its auxiliary, stated his view succinctly when he said: "Wake Up America." He made two fundamental statements on the situation in Central America: first, the problem is not with the U.S. policy, but with the areawide threat posed by the Soviet-Cuban-Nicaraguan axis; and, second, our policy and opinionmakers should not be applying a Vietnamese yardstick to an entirely different local and regional situation.

Those are the words of the leadership representing millions of brave and patriotic Americans who understand firsthand the danger our Nation faces if we should ever relent in the fight for freedom, something which is often taken for granted in the United States.

I commend the VFW leadership for its stance on the defense of the Americas, and I encourage my colleagues to take note of Mr. Currieo's straightforward message to all Members of this Congress, which follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
July 27, 1983.

To: Members of the 98th United States Congress.

From: James R. Currieo, National Commander-in-Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Having just returned from an intensive fact-finding visit to El Salvador, Honduras and Costa Rica, I am deeply convinced of two facts of life that, literally jump out at you. These facts are:

(1) the problem in Central America is not the United States or United States policy. It is Nicaraguan Marxism in service to Soviet-Cuban regional military imperialism. Nicaragua poses an area-wide threat—a veritable "Revolution Without Frontiers" as their rhetoric describes it and, as such, must be neutralized; and

(2) the dissension and division here at home over our Central American policy is a predictable by-product of much of our prestige media rigidly applying a "Vietnamese" yard stick to an entirely different local and regional situation.

Military Marxism, in my view, can be defeated without a single U.S. soldier being called upon to fight if we (a) fund and supply ammunition and equipment requested by the Administration for El Salvador, and (b) if we stop "shooting ourself in the foot" by adhering to the arbitrarily low figure of 55 trainers. (There are some 2,000-plus Cuban military in Nicaragua making the current trainer ratio about 36 communists: 1 U.S.)

As for the Nicaraguan "Contras," I spoke with Alfonso Robelo and other early Sandinista, anti-Somoza individuals. These brave freedom fighters want nothing more than what we in the United States take for granted.

I am closely considering going to the VFW membership to solicit "person to person" funds for transmittal to the "Contras." The symbolism of such non-governmental support would be of great importance.

A last word: a deadly game, not of our own making, is underway in Central America. There will be a "winner" and a "loser" and the world will know the difference.

As one deeply informed American diplomat pointed out to me: "Central America is like a loaded shotgun pointed at our soft under-belly. Our job must be to make certain this shotgun never goes off."

Defeat here for U.S. national interests is out of the question. Please advise.

Cordially,

JAMES R. CURRIEO,
National Commander-in-Chief.●

HONORING A GREAT AMERICAN: MARTIN LUTHER KING

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 2, 1983

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in just a few weeks, we will mark the 20th anniversary of the day in August 1963 when the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., stood at the steps of the Lincoln Memorial here in Washington and told tens of thousands of civil rights marchers that they had come here "to cash a check".

But, said Dr. King, that note from the Founding Fathers of this Nation had come back, stamped "insufficient funds", when millions of black citizens tried to redeem it.

That speech, with the memorable refrain, "I have a dream", stands today as one of the most eloquent pleas for social justice and humanitarian rights ever heard in this land.

It is a sad fact of life that, for many blacks, that "check" still has not been sufficiently redeemed. As the chairman of the House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, I have seen the appalling statistics which we have compiled on black life in America: Half of all black children live in poverty; 10,000 black infants will die this year before the age of 1; one-third of all black families lives below the poverty line; a depressing 70 percent of black children living in female-headed families live in poverty.

It is not too late to alter the status quo, to begin to make good on our promises. We can still turn rhetoric into reality. But it will take a new commitment and a new willingness to work for the good of all.

It is with that commitment in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I submit for the RECORD the speech which Dr. King delivered so vibrantly 20 years ago. I do this, too, in commemoration of a great philosopher, a great poet, a prophet, a leader: Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

I am happy to join with you today in what will go down in history as the greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our nation.

Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand today, signed the Emancipation Proclamation. This momentous decree came as the great beacon light of hope for millions of Negro slaves who had been scared in the flames of withering injustice. It came as the joyous daybreak to end the long night of their captivity.

But one hundred years later, the Negro still is not free. One hundred years later the life of the Negro is still badly crippled by the manacles of segregation and the chains of discrimination. One hundred years later the Negro lives on a lonely island of poverty in the midst of a vast ocean of material prosperity. One hundred years later, the Negro is still languished in the corners of American society and finds himself an exile in his own land. So we have come here today to dramatize the shameful condition.

In a sense we've come to our Nation's Capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men, yes, black men as well as white men, should be guaranteed the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check, a check which has come back marked "Insufficient Funds." But we refuse to believe the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation. So we have come to cash this check, a check that will give us upon demand, the riches of freedom and the security of justice. We have also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the fierce urgency of now.

This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice. Now is the time to lift our nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the

solid rock of brotherhood. Now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God's children.

It would be fatal for the nation to overlook the urgency of the moment. This sweltering summer of the Negro's legitimate discontent will not pass until there is an invigorating autumn of freedom and equality. Nineteen sixty-three is not an end but a beginning. Those who hoped that the Negro needed to blow off steam and will now be content will have a rude awakening if the nation returns to business as usual. There will be neither rest nor tranquility in America until the Negro is guaranteed his citizenship rights. The whirlwinds of revolt will continue to shake the foundations of our nation until the bright day of justice emerges.

But there is something I must say to my people who stand on the warm threshold which leads them to the palace of justice. In the process of gaining our rightful place we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence. Again and again we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force.

The marvelous new militancy which has engulfed the Negro community must not lead us to a distrust of all white people, for many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny. They have come to realize that their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom. We cannot walk alone.

And as we walk we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back. There are those who are asking the devotees of civil rights: "When will you be satisfied?" We can never be satisfied as long as our bodies, heavy with the fatigue of travel, cannot gain lodging in the motels of the highways and the hotels of the cities. We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro's basic mobility is from a smaller ghetto to a larger one. We can never be satisfied as long as our children are stripped of their selfhood and robbed of their dignity by signs stating: "For Whites Only." We cannot be satisfied as long as the Negro in Mississippi cannot vote and the Negro in New York believes he has nothing for which to vote. No, no, we are not satisfied and we will not be satisfied until justice rolls down like the waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.

I am not unmindful that some of you have come here out of great trials and tribulations, some of you have come fresh from narrow jail cells, some of you have come from areas where your quest for freedom left you battered by the storms of persecution and staggered by the winds of police brutality. You have been the veterans of creative suffering. Continue to work with the faith that unearned suffering is redemptive.

Go back to Mississippi, go back to Alabama, go back to South Carolina, go back to Georgia, go back to Louisiana, go back to the slums and ghettos of our northern cities, knowing that somehow this situation can and will be changed. Let us not wallow in the valley of despair.

I say to you today, my friends, even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream. I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal."

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slaveowners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

I have a dream that one day even the State of Mississippi, a state sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice. I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day down in Alabama with its vicious racists, with its Governor having his lips dripping with the words of interposition and nullification—one day right there in Alabama, little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.

I have a dream today.

I have a dream that one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low, the rough places will be made plain and the crooked places will be made straight, and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.

This is our hope. This is the faith that I go back to the South with. With this faith we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope. With this faith we will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood. With this faith we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together, to go to jail together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day.

This will be the day when all of God's children will be able to sing with new meaning:

My country 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing:
Land where my fathers died,
Land of the pilgrims' pride,
From every mountain-side
Let freedom ring.

And if America is to be a great nation, this must become true. So, let freedom ring from the prodigious hill tops of New Hampshire. Let freedom ring from the mighty mountains of New York. Let freedom ring from the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania. Let freedom ring from the snowcapped Rockies of Colorado. Let freedom ring from the curvaceous slopes of California. But not only that, let freedom ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia.

Let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee.

Let freedom ring from every hill and molehill of Mississippi. From every mountainside, let freedom ring. And when we allow freedom to ring, when we let it ring from every village, from every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual: "Free at last! free at last! thank God Almighty, we are free at last!"●

EPA NUCLEAR STANDARDS

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, in his October 8, 1981, policy statement on nuclear energy, the President articulated in a convincing manner a widely shared belief that a more abundant, affordable, and secure energy future is a critical element of this Nation's economic recovery program, that nuclear power is one of the best potential sources of new electrical energy supplies in the coming decades, and that, therefore, the Government should act in a manner consistent with the public health and safety to remove unnecessary regulatory obstacles to the development of nuclear power. Regrettably, there appear to be some at the Environmental Protection Agency who have not heeded the President's sound words and who seem to believe that any radiation associated with industrial or government activities must be eliminated even though it may have no detectable effect on the public health and safety. How else can EPA explain the national emission standards for radionuclides that it proposed on April 6, 1983.

Both the National Commission on Radiation Protection and the International Commission on Radiological Protection have proposed and support a maximum radiation exposure limit for the public of 500 millirens per year annual dose equivalent to the whole body, gonads, or bone marrow, and 1,500 millirem per year to other organs. In its proposed standards, EPA would reduce the 500/1,500 millirem exposure limit to 10 millirems per year to the whole body, gonads, or bone marrow and 30 millirems to other organs—a reduction of 98 percent. This was not based upon a comparative risk analysis as required for the establishment of these standards under section 112 of the Clean Air Act. EPA seems to have based its proposed standards on what it believes the best available technology can achieve. The absurd stringency of this proposed standard is most apparent when one considers that the average radiation exposure to all of us in the United States from environmental sources is 100 to 200 millirem per year and that the dose from only one round trip intercontinental flight can exceed a 10 millirem whole body limit. Implementation of these standards will result in the unnecessary expenditure of hundreds of millions of tax and industry dollars, will seriously impair vital national defense activities, and will provide no benefits to the health or safety of the American public.

Representative SAMUEL STRATTON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Procurement and Military Nuclear Systems of the House Armed Services Committee, wrote to EPA Administrator Ruckelshaus on June 28, 1983, calling for EPA to employ a scientifically based process of comparative risk analysis in assessing the risks to human health of radiation, just as EPA should be doing with respect to other hazardous substances. I wish to commend Mr. STRATTON for his thoughtful letter and I insert a copy of it here for the consideration of my colleagues.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., June 28, 1983.

Hon. WILLIAM D. RUCKELSHAUS,
Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: I would like to take this opportunity to express my admiration for your courage and perseverance in again assuming the leadership of the EPA. I also want to congratulate you on the address you gave to the National Academy of Sciences on June 22, 1983, wherein you endorsed the need for a government-wide process for assessing and managing health, safety and environmental risks and benefits.

The United States must place in operation a system comparable to the two-step process you recommended for the assessment of risks to human health from a given substance and a balancing of that risk against the costs of reducing or eliminating it. However, I sincerely doubt that the Director and members of EPA's Office of Radiation Programs believe it is necessary to balance risk against cost when radioactive substances are involved. It should be apparent to anyone who is aware of cosmic rays, flies in jet aircraft or skis in Colorado that EPA's proposed 10 millirem organ dose limit and the 0.2 picocurie per liter radon concentration standard for uranium mining operations are fatuous and flagrant violations of common good sense. Mr. Sjoblom and his cohorts seem to believe that any radiation associated with industrial or government activities must be suppressed with total disregard for the fact that the radiation may have no detectable effect on public health, safety and the environment but a large effect on the economy.

My Subcommittee on Procurement and Military and Nuclear Systems held hearings in 1981 and 1982 on the effects of the radon from uranium mill tailings piles on public health and safety. The consensus of the witnesses at those hearings, except for most of those from EPA and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, (NRC) was that the radon emitted by uranium mill tailings piles had absolutely negligible effect on the total population of the United States. EPA and NRC, using hypothetical and highly questionable mathematical models (there are no real data available), concluded there might be two radon induced deaths per year from lung cancer sometime in the future, if nothing were done to the piles. Please understand that there are some 100,000 to 125,000 lung cancer deaths per year in the United States, 10,000 to 25,000 of which are attributable to the emission of radon from sources in no way related to mill tailings piles. Most of the other deaths are due to smoking. To "prevent" those two hypothetically projected casualties, the EPA and NRC called for heroic and draconion measures to suppress the radon by placing 10 feet of dirt on top of the pile, reburying the tailings, etc. I must say that NRC finally saw the light and backed off from those measures which would require the expenditure of hundreds of millions to billions of dollars by government and industry.

Mr. Administrator, EPA is under intense criticism for failing to regulate exposure to toxic chemicals in the environment. It is ironic that the agency at the same time is rapidly moving to further burden already heavily regulated Atomic Energy Act activities, including defense-related activities. EPA's little-noticed regulatory emphasis on radiation is especially enigmatic. We are all exposed to radiation from natural environmental sources (e.g., cosmic radiation, radiation from natural potassium-40 in our bodies, radiation from uranium and radium found in all soils). The incremental radiation exposure attributable to so-called technology-enhanced radiation sources is trivial in comparison to these natural sources. In contrast, most toxic chemicals are synthetic and there is no natural background exposure.

EPA appears bent on eliminating all technologically-related sources of radiation exposure. It is moving toward imposing standards for emissions of radionuclides and for exposures at levels which are below natural background levels. For example, the agency has imposed a 25 millirem limit on dose to any organ of the maximally exposed person from uranium fuel cycle activities. EPA is planning to impose a 10 millirem limit for other activities, including national security activities. These limits are small fractions of average natural background exposures (100 to 200 millirem) in this country.

What is EPA's basis for taking this course? It is certainly not scientific. There are no epidemiological studies (or at least studies generally accepted as valid in the scientific community) linking exposure to radiation at levels less than 1,000 to 2,000 millirem per year to any ill health effects. To the contrary, epidemiological studies find no adverse effects from exposure to high natural background radiation. Low level radiation is simply assumed hazardous in order to be prudent for regulatory purposes. Many scientists believe that exposure to low levels of radiation, such as the levels which we all get from natural background sources, is in fact not hazardous at all.

The federally-chartered National Council on Radiation Protection (NCRP), the International Council on Radiation Protection (ICRP), and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), all support the traditional exposure limit of 500 millirems, the limit long followed in the United States and across the world. EPA's approach calling for a mammoth reduction in the 500 millirem limit to 10 or 25 millirem appears to be responding to two non-scientific concerns. The first concern is to implement a particular political philosophy. That philosophy is that it is immoral, unethical, and wrong to expose any person to any incremental radiation (or to any possibly toxic agent) associated with technology without that person's foreknowledge and specific informed consent. Under this view, consent through elected representatives is not permissible. Proponents of this view note that the Atomic Energy Act and the federal policy to develop atomic energy technology which it embodies will result in exposure of persons now or in the future to slight increments of radiation from weapons testing, nuclear waste, power plants, radiopharmaceutical plants, nuclear medicine, and so forth. They charge that the Act and the federal policy are therefore wrong and immoral because persons will be exposed to a possible risk without their specific consent. Although the "libertarian" philosophy embodied by this concern has a kind of frontier appeal, it must be recognized for what it is: repudiation of representative government and of the basic socal contract embodied in our Constitution. It amounts to espousing anarchy. It is certainly clear that we could not have a technological society—and a high standard of living—if it were pursued across the board. Simply put, there is no technology without some risks, and there is no way to get individual informed consents to technological risks in a nation with more than 200,000,000 people. To require such consents is equivalent to foregoing technology. The necessary conclusion of adopting such a policy would be for us all to return to caves and trees. It certainly would lower standards of living and shorten life expectancies.

The second concern EPA appears to be addressing in its drive against atomic energy technology is a general fear of radiation. This fear, termed "nuclear phobia", is based on public (and media) misconceptions and misinformation. People and the media fail to recognize that we are all exposed to radiation naturally; that we evolved in it; that many scientists believe that it is not hazardous at low levels; and that even if it were hazardous, there are a myriad of things we happily do which are far more risky. The phobia appears to be generated by a focus on hypothetical worst case consequences from extremely low probability events and a failure to recognize that the worst case will almost certainly never occur. The recent American Medical Association report which accused the media of conducting a "witch hunt" against dioxin is another example of the media generating hysteria, as they did at Three Mile Island.

EPA should not be acting to vindicate libertarianism or to reward unfounded fears. It should devote itself to protection against actual and significant hazards. Government action to ameliorate raw fear supposedly went out with the Salem witch trials several centuries ago.

President Reagan supposedly has a policy to support atomic energy technology in this country. If he does, that policy is certainly under concerted attack at EPA, or at least EPA's Office of Radiation Programs. The nation is well on its way to losing its leadership, and its capacity for leadership, in atomic energy technology. EPA is exacerbating the problem through insupportable regulatory standards which serve no purpose other than seeming to vindicate unfounded fears of environmental levels of radiation. The national security and our overall standard of living are the losers.

What is the solution? EPA must use some kind of comparative risk analysis in establishing its radiation regulations. It cannot persist in its arbitrary and misguided efforts to eliminate all technologically-related exposures, no matter how small, and no matter how significant relative to background releases and exposures. EPA's effort to eliminate risks from radiation will unduly elevate costs and force unwarranted reliance on less costly but more risky alternatives,

with the ironic effect of increasing overall societal risk.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Procurement and Military Nuclear Systems.●

IMF LEGISLATION

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I could not, in good conscience have voted to give the International Monetary Fund another $8.45 billion. The money simply is not needed, and my constituents have indicated their strong disapproval of this proposal.

While much speculation has been made that a general financial collapse would occur if the United States refuses to ante up another $8.45 billion, I do not see that happening. I do not see it happening because the world debt situation has been eased a great deal by the economic recovery of the United States and other industrialized nations. Interest rates are down, thereby reducing the payments debtor nations must pay.

Instead of looking for more funds, the traditional, free-market methods of dealing with debtors in trouble—renegotiation of loans to ease the burden on the debtor and thereby insuring repayment of the loan can be accomplished by the banks and debtor nations.

Even if it should prove necessary for the IMF to obtain additional capital, it doesn't have to come from the United States. The IMF has some $40 billion in gold available in its holdings which can be used as collateral for borrowing in the open market. Also, the World Bank can provide loans to debtor nations if the need exists.

Last, even if some of the loan must be written off, it will not mean the collapse of U.S. lending institutions. Those institutions need not take the loss all in 1 year; they can write it off over a period of years, thereby maintaining market discipline.

It does not seem to me that an increase in IMF funds sought from this body is vital to international financial stability. It is merely a new form of increasing foreign aid, and that, most Americans will oppose, and rightfully so.

If we want to spend more on foreign aid, and believe me, I do not, let us at least do it in a manner whereby we can control where the money goes and under what conditions it is given.

The United States has only a 20-percent voting power in the IMF, so many other countries will have a major part to play in determining where the funds will go.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is extremely unfortunate that included in the legislation before us today is the extension of authority for the Export-Import Bank. Exim has in the past extended loans mainly to large American manufacturers, however, in the legislation before us today there is a provision that will at last target Exim loan moneys for small business, and that at last, one member of Exim's Board of Directors must come from the small business community. This is all positive action to address the value and needs of small business in this country.

However, the bad news is that I am adamantly opposed to the increase for IMF and consequently voted against the bill. I believe it is extremely unfortunate that these two distinct issues could not have been brought to the floor in two packages so I would have had an opportunity to support the Exim Bank and oppose the IMF legislation.

As a member of the House Small Business Committee which is ever mindful of the needs of the small business community, I am disturbed that I must vote against a bill which contains a real breakthrough for that group.●

EUGENE CIANFLONE HONORED

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to pay tribute to Eugene Cianflone of San Diego. A 64-year-old veteran, Mr. Cianflone has the rare talent of bringing happiness to others. For he is a bugler who plays for others less fortunate than he is. When Mr. Cianflone plays at local VA hospitals, veterans and servicemen forget for a moment their sorrows and misfortunes. "I love it when people enjoy the bugle. Hey, I enjoy it. It means a lot to me," Mr. Cianflone has often said.

In World War II, Mr. Cianflone joined the Navy, but declined an opportunity to become a bugler at the Richmond, Va., naval base, choosing instead to go to sea. While as a motor machinist mate, he saw action in the first battle of the Philippine Sea and in the Saipan invasion.

Mr. Cianflone regularly dons his Veteran of Foreign Wars uniform and totes his bugle to wherever his music is needed. For 25 years, he has trumpeted the sounds of "When the Caisons Go Rolling Along," "Over There," "Battle Hymn of the Republic," and other traditional songs.

In appreciation of his efforts for others, Mr. Cianflone has received more than 1,000 letters of thanks and commendation, as well as plaques. He has been honored by former Presidents Ford, Nixon, Johnson, and Carter, as well as by President Reagan.

Thus, today, Mr. Speaker, I wish to honor Mr. Cianflone. It is rare that you find someone so dedicated to helping others. This country should be proud knowing that Mr. Cianflone continues to devote his life to providing joy for many other people.●

THE COLUMBIA RIVER GORGE ACT OF 1983

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues from the Oregon and Washington delegations, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. BONKER, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. LOWRY of Washington and Mr. CHANDLER in introducing legislation to preserve and protect one of this Nation's great scenic wonders, the Columbia River Gorge.

The entire congressional delegations of Oregon and Washington, in conjunction with Governors Spellman and Atiyeh, have deliberated long and hard on how to best preserve and manage the Columbia River Gorge.

Since the early 1900's, there have been countless proposals to preserve the Columbia River Gorge—an area of dynamic, yet fragile beauty. And the cycle has always been the same. Proposals have been put forth, built up, put down and thrown out.

We believe the effort we are launching today will be different. We believe that for the first time we have laid the groundwork for a consensus that will not only provide for the orderly management and preservation of the gorge, but also will be able to weather the political challenges. We believe that because we have laid this groundwork among ourselves, while acting in concert with the Governors, consensus legislation will ultimately pass in both houses of the Congress and be signed by the President.

Our consensus product has as its touchstone several key principles.

First, we are agreed that a Columbia River Gorge protection measure needs to treat the gorge as a single entity and to provide for its management in a regional manner that supersedes the interests of the two States, the six counties and many municipalities and special districts within the gorge. This bill does that.

Second, we are agreed that a Columbia River Gorge protection measure needs to be sensitive to the needs of local residents, many of whom have had ancestors in the region for dec-

ades. More than 40,000 persons live in gorge cities, towns, and rural communities and they have a fundamental right to continued enjoyment of their homes and the assurance of their economic well-being. This bill provides that assurance.●

COLUMBIA RIVER GORGE ACT OF 1983

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues from Washington and Oregon in the introduction of the Columbia River Gorge Act of 1983.

The magnificent Columbia River Gorge, stretching 90 miles, shared by both our States. From the arid desert in the east, the Columbia River cuts through the Cascade Crest to the west where it is bordered by rich forest. For 11,000 years, this river has continued to be the main transportation and trade route in the Northwest.

A million people from the Vancouver, Wash., and Portland areas enjoy the gorge for recreational use. Some 40,000 people make their homes there. The Columbia remains a critical transportation route, an irreplaceable source of hydroelectric energy, and an area where the forest products industry still thrives.

At the same time, this awe-inspiring gorge is home to unique geological and ecological features. Its cultural values, from the historical use of the area by Native Americans to pieces of the Oregon Trail that remain intact, are immeasuable.

It is not the current use of the gorge with which this legislation is concerned, but a balance of future uses that will preserve both the environmental and economic values of the gorge for generations to come.

Currently, there are more than 50 local, State, and Federal agencies with governmental authority in the gorge. The differing policies of these entities has made comprehensive planning for the future a near impossible task.

The Columbia River Gorge Act of 1983 will create a regional management commission with the authority to write and implement a comprehensive management plan for future uses in the gorge.

We introduce this legislation at the request of Washington Gov. John Spellman and Oregon Gov. Victor Atiyeh. Both Governors deserve praise for their diligent work with all affected interests in attempting to build a workable consensus for management of the gorge. A similar bill will be introduced in the Senate.

No one of the sponsors of this legislation today can embrace each feature of the bill. What is remarkable is that we each, from our respective States and districts, have agreed to work together to enact what will become a true consensus.

I look forward to timely hearings on this measure that will afford the Congress ample opportunity to hear further from all affected interests. I believe enactment of such consensus legislation is possible, in part, because of my experience with similar legislation that resulted in establishment of the Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Monument.

In dealing with that legislation, we began with widely diverse points of view. But all parties worked closely together and the result was a true compromise.

There are a few changes from the Governors' draft which I would like to address at this time. The county representation on the 14-member commission has been made more flexible: While the Governors' draft said that all six county representatives must be elected officials, this bill says they may be either elected officials or residents of the respective counties. The language dealing with authority to condemn property makes more clear the intent of Congress that no existing homes or other structures in existence at the time of enactment may be condemned. Finally, the President is given broader authority in appointing ex officio members to the commission, including a representative of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, Corps of Engineers, Bonneville Power Administration, and any other Federal or State agency representative which the President may deem appropriate. These members will be nonvoting.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank particularly my colleagues who share with me the pleasure of representing those who live within or near the gorge. I have long enjoyed working with SID MORRISON in solving public land use problems. My colleagues from Oregon, RON WYDEN and BOB SMITH, have worked hard to introduce this legislation.

Like the users of the gorge itself, we too are a diverse group. I look forward to the continued partnership between our States which has bought us this far toward a solution to management of the Columbia River Gorge.

Last, I would like to pay special thanks to the Friends of the Columbia Gorge, Protect the Gorge Committee, and other groups that have worked on various legislation concerning this issue. While I know that neither side will embrace this bill, I am pleased that both are committed to working with us toward a final compromise.●

THE TAX CUT: HOPE FOR A STRONGER RECOVERY

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Carroll Times-Georgian shows that the tax cut means that the recovery will continue strongly. The Times-Georgian is a small daily newspaper in my district—not a large newspaper which caters to special interests. Its' support of the tax cut indicates that it is the average working American who benefits from it.

The editorial also cautions us about large deficits. We must understand that these deficits are caused by higher and higher Federal spending. While this article does not suggest an immediate solution to this problem, it does suggest that we should keep the tax cut.

[From the Times-Georgian, July 9, 1983]

EDITORIAL OPINION.—TAX CUT HERALDS NEW FISCAL YEAR

July 1 marked the beginning of the final phase of President Reagan's three-year tax cut. Senate defeat of a Democratic-led "tax cap" effort allowed President Reagan to put away his veto pen, thus giving $30 billion more to taxpayers' paychecks during the next fiscal year.

For the average family of four with an annual income of $22,300, that amounts to about, $6 a week. Higher-income (and taxpaying) Americans—who were the object of the Democratic proposal—may see an extra Andrew Jackson each week ($20). In either case, many will say, "big deal."

Unlike last year's tax cut which took effect during an economic downturn, this one is coinciding with a burgeoning economic recovery. So it could indeed be a big deal.

It may be, for many, the difference between buying or not buying a new car, or any durable goods that will turn a recovery into a boom. Some auto industry officials are predicting it could result in the sale of 300,000 extra cars this year, for example.

Many of those "wealthier" taxpayers who the Democrats said would be unfairly benefited by the reduction, may be more enthusiastic about putting their extra dollars into savings accounts that fuel home and commercial loans. Some of the money is bound to go toward maintaining the current bull market on Wall Street.

To others, the tax cut will not be a reduction in taxes so much as a reduction in the growth of taxes. If one remembers, that was how President Reagan originally characterized his plan to parcel out $90 billion from the U.S. treasury over a three-year period as a way to spur economic growth.

The dark side of the tax cut, of course, is that it isn't much help in the effort to reduce record federal deficits that many economists fear may ultimately shorten the economic recovery.

With a presidential election year looming, it is probably too much to hope for any bipartisan resolution of the deficit problem in the near future. But one recommendation from Charls Walker, the deputy secretary

of the Treasury under President Nixon, is worth studying.

If an economic recovery, aided by the tax cuts, doesn't begin to whittle down the deficits, Walker suggests that a bipartisan commission be created to devise a deficit reduction plan—similar to the one that faced the Social Security crisis.

For the moment, however, let's give this real tax break a chance to work.●

THE POPULATION CRISIS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the world population crisis has reached epidemic proportions. The Global 2000 Report outlines the crisis that the world is facing. If present trends continue, in the year 2000 the Earth will be more crowded, more polluted, less stable ecologically, and tremendously more vulnerable to disruption than the world we live in now.

The current supply of resources, both renewable and non-renewable are strained to the breaking point and something must be done. The demand for these resources grows in exponential fashion as the population grows and the standard of living increases. The United States, having recognized the existence of the problem, has placed itself in the position of saying "do as I say, not as I do." We strongly encourage and give assistance to countries to control their population growth. However we do nothing to develop our own population policy.

Congress has so far avoided addressing the issue of population stabilitization despite our specific commitment to do so in the 1974 World Population Plan.

To being to address this problem Senator HATFIELD and I have offered the Global Resources, Environment and Population Act of 1983 (H.R. 2491/S. 1025). The main purpose of this act is: To coordinate national planning for population change, to attain a balance between population, natural resource use, and environmental needs; to encourage population stabilization and voluntary family planning; and finally to establish an Interagency Council administered by the Office of the President, at no additional administrative costs.

The Interagency Council would be composed of the Secretaries and Administrators of the 19 Federal Agencies which already formulate policies on population and environmental issues. The council would coordinate population research by Federal agencies, review Federal policies and programs, develop and recommend a national population policy proposal which would promote population stabilization and would recommend to the President a policy to encourage global population stabilization.

Policymakers must be alerted to the impact and consequences of unplanned population growth and distribution. We will exhaust our resource supply if we do not plan carefully. Failure to account for demographic changes has already resulted in enormous waste as we build new schools and hospitals in areas of declining need.

We must coordinate the projections that are done in various Government agencies if we are to make a future for our children and our grandchildren that has an adequate supply of resources to meet their needs.

I would like to commend to my colleagues' attention the following article which appeared recently in USA Today. I would also like to request their support for H.R. 2491, The Global Resources Environment and Population Act of 1983. We will not have a future if we do not plan for it.

[From USA Today]

WE MUST ACT NOW, BEFORE IT'S TOO LATE

(By Carole L. Baker)

WASHINGTON.—World population growth—like an illness with no warning system—is the most dangerous of conditions because its consequences aren't noticed until it's too late.

It is the obese man ignoring his physician and health, getting bigger and bigger. So-called "friends" say he looks fine . . . until the massive coronary.

Population growth is not a single dramatic event, but a constant process—one whose current scale promotes soil erosion and deforestation, overgrazing, poverty, malnutrition, illiteracy, political instability and military conflict.

Examples are everywhere.

There are still those who claim, citing a gradual lowering of world birth rates, that the patient looks fine, despite staggering growth. This is a dangerous mistake to make; slighty lower birth rates can't compare to the ever-expanding world population base we now have.

The compounding aspect of exponential growth is enormous. It took all of history up to 1830 to reach the first billion people. The second billion took only 100 years. Now the world adds another billion every 12 years.

All estimates project 6 billion people by the year 2000 . . . in just 17 years.

This is one-third more people added to our planet, mostly in the developing nations. Tragically, these nations, least able to meet their basic needs, also have the highest population growth rates. No government can expect to improve living standards when a nation's population growth outpaces its economic output.

Increasingly, this is the dilemma of the developing world.

Industrial nations are also straining their ability to support their people, because of high per capita use of energy and raw materials.

The United States continues to grow by more than 2 million per year. With only five percent of the world's population, this country consumes 11 times the world's average of energy, six times the steel, and four times the grain.

The United States must face these issues here at home. We are the fastest growing industrial nation in the world, but the United States still has no population policy, no demographic goals or capacity to identify or plan for future trends.

Legislation now before Congress—The Global Resource, Environment and Population Act of 1983—would begin to answer these needs. By not taking action on population, governments ignore their responsibility. We must stabilize population growth.

In the words of Worldwatch president Les Brown, "We are not inheriting the earth from our fathers—we are borrowing it from our children."●

DENNIS BRUTUS

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 3, 1983

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I remember attending grade school and, in the mornings, rising with my classmates to pledge allegiance to our flag. I especially remember repeating the last phrase of that pledge to myself after the class had finished "with liberty and justice for all." Those words really meant something to me, and I was proud to live in a country that offered both those fundamental rights to everyone.

Well, Mr. Speaker, our colleague Mr. FRANK has drawn our attention to an instance in which a man in our country might be denied both the liberty and the justice to which he is entitled. Mr. FRANK has introduced H.R. 3705 for the relief of Mr. Dennis Brutus, a South African poet and outspoken critic of apartheid who is in the midst of a battle over efforts to deport him to southern Africa.

Mr. Brutus' fears about returning to southern Africa are not unfounded. Although born in Zimbabwe, he grew up in South Africa. In the early 1960's he was arrested for his antiapartheid activities and was released only on the condition that he would be imprisoned if he ever returned to South Africa. Mr. Brutus faces potential dangers in other countries as well. Just last year, a former nationalist leader in South Africa with whom Brutus was imprisoned was fatally shot in Zimbabwe, allegedly by the South African secret police.

Mr. Brutus has lived in the United States for the past 10 years. He has been a professor of African and English literature at Northwestern University for many of those years. Why, then, is he facing potential deportation? Mr. Speaker, Dennis Brutus could be deported because of a technical violation of the immigration statutes. He originally held a British passport, and it was with this document that he obtained his visa, which granted him permission to work here. But

when Zimbabwe became an independent nation in 1980, Mr. Brutus' passport was revoked. Zimbabwe issued a new one, but he was late in applying for the extension of his visa here. Then his file was misplaced for 6 months. Thus, when he continued to work at Northwestern University, he violated a law that forbids employment of an alien with an expired visa.

Despite the unusual circumstances, the State Department is zealously pursuing action against Mr. Brutus. He has been told by these authorities that he could return to Great Britain, where he lived and worked after he left Africa in 1966. The British authorities, however, present a different picture: They advised him that his immigration rights have lapsed in Britain because he failed to live there for 2 years.

Furthermore, the State Department has indicated that he is excludable from the United States under the McCarran-Walters Act, but has refused to tell Mr. Brutus why he has been judged excludable. He needs that information to defend his position. The Department is using classified documents and, as commonsense tells us, it is quite difficult to refute information that is not known. Surely this is a violation of those very rights to which I pledged allegiance so many years ago.

As Chairman of the Congressional Arts Caucus, I have yet another interest in allowing Mr. Brutus to remain in our country. He offers an irreplacable cultural asset to our nation. He has distinguished himself in his position as Professor of African literature at Northwestern University. Few scholars have contributed so much to a better understanding of African culture and the dynamics of the apartheid system as Mr. Brutus. And, on top of his academic career, Mr. Brutus is an award winning poet. He has published seven collections of poetry, including "Sirens, Knuckles and Boots" (1962) and "Letters to Martha and Other Poems from a South African Prison" (1969). Instead of harassing and deporting this talented man, we should support his efforts and leave his mind free to produce his artwork in an unrestricted society.

I know that I am not alone in this position of defending Mr. Brutus for his artistic and academic ability. The Authors League of America, Inc., has recently submitted a letter of support to Hon. Irving Schwartz, the judge who is presiding over Mr. Brutus' trial. The letter reads:

American authors join American teachers and scholars, distinguished representatives of the black community, members of Congress and others in urging that political asylum be granted to Dennis Brutus. It would be shocking if our government, which justly condemns the deportation and oppression of teachers and poets by authoritarian regimes, were to expel this eminent teachers and literary artist.

Sincerely yours,

HARRISON E. SALISBURY,
President, The Authors League of America.
ANNE EDWARDS,
President, The Authors Guild.

Mr. Speaker, if the Immigration and Naturalization Service were to deport Mr. Brutus because of the violation of a technicality, the United States would be expelling a world-renowned leader in the field of human rights, a master poet, an outstanding scholar, and an exceptional teacher. We have no choice but to grant him political asylum.●

NATIONAL AVIATON HALL OF FAME

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. FUQUA.. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to draw the attention of my colleagues to the ceremonies that took place on July 23, 1983, in honor of four men inducted into the National Aviation Hall of Fame. They are men who continue to epitomize the history of flight, its challenges and its rewards. These four men, like the 97 who proceeded them, represent the accomplishments and the courage of the individual who seeks to meet the challenges of flight, challenges which include military combat, research and development, as well as, industrial innovation.

It was an honor for me to be present at ceremonies honoring the men who have brought aviation to where it is today. The creation of the Aviation Hall of Fame in Dayton, Ohio, is a beautiful facility supported by the contributions of individuals and organizations who wish to enshrine the names of the men and women who have taken an aggressive role in the development and evolution of flight. The men enshrined in 1983 are representative of the innovation of mankind, in the arena of aviation.

I feel especially privileged to have attended the ceremonies this year due to the induction of an individual with whom I have had the special pleasure of working, A. Scott Crossfield. Scott has served as technical consultant for our Committee on Science and Technology since 1977. His expertise in the area of aviation has been of extreme value to the work of the committee and it was a special honor for me to have been present.

I would like to submit for the record the biographies of these four individuals because I feel that their accomplishments speak for themselves.

NATIONAL AVIATION HALL OF FAME 1983
ENSHRINED AVIATION PIONEERS

DAVID SINTON INGALLS

Born in Cleveland, Ohio, his interest in aviation blossomed while attending Yale University in 1916–17. There he joined the First Yale Aviation Unit and began flight training at Huntington Beach, Long Island. Just prior to the United States' entry into World War I, he enlisted in the Naval Reserve Flying Forces and completed his flight training at West Palm Beach, Florida as Naval Aviator No. 85. Sailing for Europe in September 1917, he received additional flight training at Gosport, England, and Turnbury, Scotland, before reporting to the Dunkirk, France, Naval Air Station in March, 1918. After additional training in France, he was temporarily assigned to British Royal Air Force Squadron 213 conducting operations against German submarine bases at Ostend, Zeebrugge, and Bruges, Belgium. In August and September, 1918, he was credited with shooting down at least four enemy airplanes and one or more balloons to become the Navy's only "Ace" in World War I. Relieved of duty with the 213th in October, 1918, he served as a ferry pilot and instructor at Eastleigh, England. For his war efforts he was awarded the American Distinguished Service Medal, the French Legion of Honor and the British Distinguished Flying Cross.

After the war, Ingalls re-entered Yale and received an AB degree in 1920. Then he enrolled in the Harvard Law School and earned his LLB degree in 1923. He joined the law firm of Squire, Sanders and Dempsey in Cleveland and practiced law there until 1929. Meanwhile, he was elected to the Ohio Legislature in 1926 and in 1928, where he co-sponsored the Aviation Code Act of Ohio, a model later adopted by many states. He also helped plan the Cleveland, Ohio, airport. In 1929, his outstanding qualifications came to the attention of President Hoover, who appointed him Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Aeronautics. During the next three years he guided the rapid advancement of the Naval Aviation Test and Development Program, and was also commissioned a lieutenant commander in the Naval Reserves.

During the early years of World War II, he served as vice president and general manager of Pan American Ferries, Inc. Then in 1942 he went on active duty as Assistant Operations Officer on the Staff of the Commander of Air Forces Pacific. He then served as executive officer to the Forward Area and Air Center Commander at Guadalcanal. In 1944 he became Plans Officer with the South Pacific Forces, and later commanded the Pearl Harbor Naval Air Station. Retiring from active duty in 1945, after receiving the Legion of Merit and the Bronze Star, he transferred to the Navy's Retired List in 1959 with the rank of rear admiral.

After the war, he continued his association with Pan Am, and also became president and publisher of the Cincinnati Times-Star Newspaper from 1953 to 1955. He also continued an active interest in law and politics.

THEODORE VON KARMAN

Born in Budapest, Hungary, he first earned a mechanical engineering degree at the Royal Joseph University. He later became an assistant professor at the Technical Institute of Budapest and received his Ph.D. at the University of Gottingen in Germany. In 1911 he discovered aeronautical vortex drag, later known as "Kármán

Vortex Street". This led to his accepting the aeronautical chair at the Technische Hochscule in Aachen, Germany. During World War I he set up a department of aviation for the Austro-Hungarian Army and helped develop a tethered reconnaissance helicopter.

After the war, he returned to Aachen as director of the University's Institute of Aeronautics, and became a consultant on Junkers aircraft and also on Zepplin's dirigible, Los Angeles.

Fleeing growing anti-semitism in Germany in 1929, von Kármán became director of the Guggenheim Aeronautical Laboratory at the California Institute of Technology and of the Daniel Guggenheim Airship Institute in Akron, Ohio. He also became a consultant on the Navy dirigibles Akron and Macon, as well as to Northrop on revolutionary aircraft construction and wing fairings to eliminate buffeting.

In 1935, he presented the first theories on air drag at supersonic speeds. His group also initiated the GALCIT Rocket Research Project, which led to the development of JATO rockets to assist aircraft takeoffs, and to the formation of the Aerojet Engineering Company. He also became a consultant to Northrop on flying wing and rocket-powered aircraft; to Boeing on high speed wind tunnels; to Lockheed on aircraft designs; to the Army Air Forces on supersonic aircraft; and to Army Ordnance on long-range missiles.

In 1944, General Arnold asked von Karman to form and chair an Army Air Forces Scientific Advisory Group to develop a blueprint for air research needed in the next 50 years. The Group's reports, "Toward New Horizons" and "Science, The Key to Air Supremacy", served to guide Air Force developments throughout the next decade. The subsequent Scientific Advisory Board was instrumental in the development of the Atlas ICBM, the formation of the Rand Corporation, and the building of the supersonic X-15 rocket research plane.

Later, he helped establish and chaired the Advisory Group for Aeronautical Research and Development, to assist NATO countries develop mutual defense capabilities. Then in 1960 he was instrumental in forming the International Academy of Astronautics. In 1963 President Kennedy presented von Kármán the nation's first National Medal of Science for his lifetime of contributions, just prior to his death.

THORNTON ARNOLD WILSON

Born in Sikeston, Missouri, and graduated by Iowa State University with a degree in aeronautical engineering, Wilson joined the Boeing Airplane Company in 1943 as a junior engineer. There he worked on the C-97 stratofrieghter and the Model 377 Stratocruiser.

After receiving a Master of Science degree from Cal Tech in 1948, he returned to Boeing, where he worked as an aerodynamicist and later as an Aerodynamic Senior Group Engineer on the B-47 Stratojet, the nation's first multijet bomber. After studying industrial management at M.I.T. on a Sloan Fellowship, he was named a Senior Group Engineer in Charge of the preliminary design of supersonic bombers in 1953. His work led to the B-52 Stratofortress, which became the principal strike force bomber of the Strategic Air Command. After managing the design and construction of a new supersonic wind tunnel, he was named Assistant to Boeing's Chief Engineer in 1955. As such, he became involved in the KC-135 tanker for the Air Force, and the 707 jetliner that put Boeing back into the commercial aircraft business and opened a new era of jet travel.

A major challenge came in 1958 when Wilson was named Program Manager of the Minuteman Advance Projects Proposal Team which won the contract assignment to perform the final assembly and tests of the Minuteman ICBM. Later he was elected Vice President of Boeing's Aerospace Divison and Manager of its Minuteman Ballistic Missile Branch, which aided the missile becoming operational with the Air Force in 1963.

In 1964, Wilson was named Boeing's corporate Vice President of Operations and Planning and he was involved in the introduction of the Boeing 727 trijet airliner, one of the world's most successful jetliners. Then after serving briefly as Vice President and General Manager of Boeing's Military Airplane Division, he returned to corporate headquarters again as Vice President of Operations and Planning. As such, he was involved in the Boeing 737 short-haul jetliner.

In 1966 he was promoted to Executive Vice President and named to Boeing's board of directors, as the Boeing 747 jetliner was being developed. Then in 1968 he was elected president of Boeing and in 1969 was also named Chief Executive Officer. As such he led the company through a period of severe economic recession in the early '70's, as the 747 was entering commercial service. Then in 1972 he was named Chairman of the Board. In recent years, he led Boeing's efforts that won the MX Cruise Missile Contract and introduced the new technology, fuel efficient 757 and 767 jetliners.

A. SCOTT CROSSFIELD

Born in Berkeley, California, he began taking flying lessons at the age of twelve. Later he soloed at the age of fifteen. In 1940 he entered the University of Washington and later earned his private pilot license. Withdrawing from the University, he went to work for The Boeing Airplane Company. After Pearl Harbor, he enlisted in the Navy, earned his wings, and served as a flight and gunnery instructor before being assigned to Air Group 51 aboard the carrier *Langley*.

After the war, he earned a Bachelor and Master degree in aeronautical engineering at the University of Washington. Then he joined NACA at Edwards Air Force Base, where he completed the Experimental Flight Test Pilots School, and began test flights of the Bell X-1 and X-5, the Douglas Skystreak and Skyrocket and the Northrop X-4. During this period, he made the first Keplerian trajectory flights to test the effects of weightlessness. In 1953, he flew the Douglas Skyrocket at twice the speed of sound, a historic flight milestone.

In 1955, Crossfield joined North American Aviation as a design specialist on the X-15 rocket research plane. As such, he helped develop flight control, display and telemetering systems, and the full pressure flying suit. After he was promoted to Chief Test Pilot, he then became the first pilot to successfully attain the speed of Mach 3 in the X-15 in 1960.

After being named Director of Systems Test of North American's Space and Information Division, Crossfield was instrumental in the development of the Hound Dog missile. Then named Director of Test and Quality Assurance, he was also involved in the Apollo, Saturn II, and Paraglider programs.

Crossfield joined Eastern Air Lines in 1967 as Division Vice President of Flight Research and Development, and Flight Operations. As such, he developed an area navigation system test study in the Boston-New York-Washington corridor to relieve air congestion. In 1971, as Staff Vice President of Transportation Systems Development for Eastern, he was involved in developing a National Short Haul Transportation Plan, which later became the basis for FAA's current navigation plan.

In 1974, Crossfield became Senior Vice President of Hawker Siddeley Aviation, Inc. and developed specifications for its HS 146 short-haul airliner. Then in 1975 he became a technical consultant to the House of Representatives' subcommittee on Transportation, Aviation and Materials. In 1977 he became a consultant to the House Committee on Science and Technology with extensive interfacing with DOD, Air Force, Navy, NASA and FAA personnel and committees.●

THE COAL PIPELINE ACT OF 1983

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing new legislation to establish a procedure to permit coal pipelines determined to be in the national interest and required by the public convenience and necessity to exercise the power of Federal eminent domain to acquire rights-of-way for pipeline construction.

Earlier this session H.R. 1010, the Coal Pipeline Act of 1983 was reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. In the last several weeks, members of those committees have met to attempt to reconcile the versions of the bill reported by the two committees. Although agreement has been reached on most issues, we have not been able to achieve a consensus on all provisions of the legislation.

The legislation I am introducing today is my best effort to write a bill that incorporates the agreements that have been reached with the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. I believe that it is also a fair compromise on the issues that we were unable to resolve.

It is my intention to request the Committee on Rules to make this bill in order as a substitute to H.R. 1010.●

ISSUES OF PRODUCTIVITY, INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION AND TRADE

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to address the issues of productivity, international competition and trade. Collectively, the interplay of these economic forces directly affects

the well-being of my constituents. Due to the inability of the Reagan administration to succesfully manage our economy, we now have an industrial crisis that has resulted in unacceptably high levels of unemployment, a declining manufacturing base, and an increasing deficit in our balance of trade.

The structure and performance of American industry is undergoing profound changes. Profit losses, declining production and a loss of our trade competitiveness are serious long-term problems. These changes will eventually require restructuring of existing industries and encouragement of new industries. There are compelling reasons why industrial competitiveness on a global scale is crucial to our social and economic well-being. Unless the United States improves its ability to compete internationally, unless we develop a coherent, long-term approach, and address our problems from a global perspective—I fear that domestic economic revitalization will remain an elusive goal.

Mr. Speaker, our approach to increasing productivity must be comprehensive and based on new and changing economic realities. Given the emergence of a global marketplace, a turn inward will be self-defeating in the long run. Our mandate must not be to punish or retard the competitive gains by other nations, but to insure our competitiveness within the global marketplace.

Operating in a world economy means that the economic functions of production, distribution, finance, communications, and transportation are now global rather than national. This includes the global exchange of research and development results as well as management techniques and skills. Efficient production today must be based upon the resources of the entire planet, not just on those of one country.

Our national competitive effort will require investment in physical capital (plant and equipment) and human capital, as well as a commitment to technological innovation. As a nation, we have the tools: A rich knowledge base; an energetic and creative people; a flexible form of democratic government; and a wealth of scientific advances and technological breakthroughs waiting only to be put to productive use.

Other nations are aggressively industrializing. They do not have to do without as they once did, nor do they have to depend upon U.S. producers. In fact, many have more modern plants than those in the United States. As a result, their goods are less expensive—they are more competitive producers than the United States. Under such circumstances, it is imperative that U.S. export policies be improved to help rectify this situation.

Toward this end, I believe it is important for the United States to adopt a national trade policy that allows our domestic manufacturers and service-oriented industries to creatively compete on a fair and equitable basis with other countries. To facilitate this process, we should vigorously pursue economic policies that encourage the export of U.S. goods, services and technologies. Every $1 billion in exports translates into 40,000 U.S. jobs. By increasing our overseas sales, we will be able to effectively compete in the international marketplace—and reduce unemployment—without resorting to protective tariffs that would eventually result in increased costs to the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I consider these issues too crucial to be left to the whims of the marketplace. To address the concerns I have raised today, I have set aside Monday, September 19, 1983, to hold a conference in my district on productivity. Seven aspects of productivity will be considered by witnesses from business, labor, academia, and government. They are: First, capital investment; second, human resources; third, research, development and technological innovation; fourth, role of Government in the economy; fifth, Government organization and operations; sixth, private sector initiatives; and seventh, international competition and productivity.

The recommendations made at this conference will then be submitted to the White House Conference on Productivity. Only by involving the people of this country in the decisionmaking process, can we hope to rationally and systematically address the questions of productivity, international competition, and trade.

Thank you.●

RESOLUTION OPPOSING SHIPMENT OF NUCLEAR REACTOR PARTS TO INDIA

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution calling upon the President not to ship nuclear reactor parts to India's Tarapur nuclear powerplant unless India makes firmer nuclear nonproliferation guarantees.

Joining me in cosponsoring this important legislation are Congressmen RICHARD L. OTTINGER, JACK F. KEMP, MORRIS K. UDALL, HAMILTON FISH, JR., JAMES L. OBERSTAR, and JAMES M. JEFFORDS.

Senators RUDY BOSCHWITZ (R-Minn.) and JOHN GLENN (D-Ohio) have introduced the same resolution in the Senate.

The resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that the United States should not export or help arrange for other countries to export nuclear reactor components to India's Tarapur nuclear powerplant near Bombay unless the Govenment of India provides stronger nonproliferation guarantees, which should include (1) reliable assurances by India that it is not engaged in a program to develop nuclear weapons and will not explode additional nuclear devices; and (2) agreement by India to extend the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards provisions in the United States-India nuclear cooperation agreement in perpetuity.

On June 30, Secretary of State George Shultz assured the Indian Government that it will be supplied reactor components for Tarapur. India has maintained that the parts are needed to operate the U.S.-built plant safely.

The problems at the Tarapur nuclear reactor, however, involve high levels of radioactive contamination resulting from deteriorated nuclear fuel, which India manufactured. This defective fuel has contaminated the plant's coolant, which is leaking from seals, flanges, pumps, and other components. The high level of contamination thus has made it nearly impossible to perform the maintenance needed to operate the plant safely.

While the supply of spare parts could reduce somewhat the radiation exposure to plant workers and lead to some improvement in plant maintenance, it would not make the plant safe. On the contrary, it would simply allow the plant to continue in an unsafe condition. Even Homi N. Sethna, chairman of India's Atomic Energy Commission, has admitted that decontamination of the plant would take 6 months to 1 year.

In other words, the safety problems Tarapur are India's fault not the United States. The Indian Government, in effect, is asking for the reactor parts and to maintain its right to proliferate. The United States should not go along with such demands.

In 1974, India detonated a nuclear device using material that had been diverted from its civilian nuclear facilities.

Largely as a result of the India explosion, the United States enacted in 1978 the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act, which stipulated that nations like India could no longer receive United States nuclear materials unless they accepted International Atomic Energy Agency inspections on all their nuclear facilities.

In 1980, even though India had steadfastly refused to accept full-scope IAEA safeguards or to rule out the possibility that it would detonate another bomb, Congress agreed to ignore

the Nonproliferation Act and ship 38 tons of enriched uranium to the Tarapur nuclear facility near Bombay.

In 1982, with India still refusing full-scope IAEA sefeguards and threatening to reprocess U.S.-origin spent fuel for its bomb-usable plutonium, the Reagan administration circumvented the Nonproliferation Act's restriction by arranging for the French to ship enriched uranium to Tarapur.

Today, with India still refusing to budge on nonproliferation and with reports surfacing that it is preparing for another nuclear test, the State Department is recommending that reactor components be sent to Tarapur.

It is time to say no to India.

"No" is a word this country has been loathe to say in the implementation of its nonproliferation policy—particularly as it relates to India.

For too long, the State Department has stumbled over itself to be a good nuclear supplier to India. It is about time they became concerned about whether India has been a good customer.

This is not a case of India having a nuclear supply problem with the United States.

The United States is having a proliferation problem with India.

Our resolution urges the President to extract—at the very least—two very minimal guarantees from the Indian Government before the reactor components are shipped: First, that India assure the United States that it is not building nuclear weapons and will not explode a nuclear device, and second, that India agree to continue IAEA safeguards on the Tarapur plant after the nuclear cooperation agreement ends in 1993.

For a nation founded on the pacifism of Mohandas Ghandi, I do not see how these guarantees could be considered unreasonable.

Ever since the Nonproliferation Act was passed in 1978, the executive branch has maintained that the United States should continue to supply India with nuclear material so we can use the supplies as leverage to get the Indians to abide by the act. But after 5 years, Congress is beginning to realize that we have been free and easy with the supplies, but we have never used the leverage.

It is time now for the United States to use its leverage and reaffirm its commitment to halt the spread of nuclear weapons.

The following is a text of the resolution:

Resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that nuclear reactor components should not be exported from the United States for India's Tarapur nuclear power station unless the Government of India provides stronger nonproliferation guarantees.

Whereas, halting the spread of nuclear weapons is one of the primary goals of United States foreign policy;

Whereas, the United States, along with 117 nations, is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation on Nuclear Weapons;

Whereas, the Congress enacted the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 which is designed to establish guidelines for the export of the nuclear materials and technology;

Whereas, the Government of India has made an urgent request to the United States for nuclear reactor components for its nuclear power station at Tarapur;

Whereas, India is not a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and has not agreed to place its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards;

Whereas, the Government of India conducted a nuclear explosion in 1974 and has refused to rule out future nuclear tests;

Whereas, there have been reports indicating that the Government of India is preparing for another nuclear test, which would require a cutoff of United States nuclear exports under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978.

Whereas, in order to provide the requested nuclear reactor components to India, the President may have to waive the requirement for such a cutoff of United States nuclear exports;

Whereas, the nuclear cooperation agreement between the United States and India provides that nuclear facilities supplied by the United States to India shall be subject to international safeguards; and

Whereas, this agreement expires in 1993 and India has not agreed to extend its safeguard provisions in perpetuity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States Government should not export or help arrange for other countries to export nuclear reactor components for the nuclear power station at Tarapur, India, unless the Government of India provides to the United States Government stronger nuclear nonproliferation guarantees. These guarantees should include, at a minimum—

(1) reliable assurances by the government of India that it is not engaged in a program to develop nuclear weapons and will not explode additional nuclear devices; and

(2) agreement by the Government of India to extend the safeguard provisions in the United States-Indian nuclear cooperation agreement in perpetuity.

SEC. 2. The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall transmit a copy of this resolution to the President.●

NEW RESEARCH ON DIABETES

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to a recently established joint research project between the Washington University School of Medicine and the McDonnell Douglas Corp., both of St. Louis, Mo., to pursue research on purification techniques that could lead to new treatments for diabetes.

The joint research focuses on separating insulin-producing beta cells from pancreatic tissue. Washington University scientists have for more than 10 years been attempting to improve isolation and purification of insulin-producing beta cells in order to provide effective transplantation to control diabetes. Transplantation of pancreatic islets—groups of cells which contain beta cells—has successfully controlled diabetes in laboratory animals.

What is especially exciting about this research effort is that space shuttle flights are aiding in this project. The electrophoresis operations in space project, part of the McDonnell Douglas Astronautics Co., has developed a device which separates materials in a solution by subjecting them to an electrical field. This device has been tested on three space shuttle fights and has shown in the zero gravity of space the ability to separate over 700 times more materials and to achieve purity levels more than four times greater than is possible in similar operations on Earth.

According to David Scharp, M.D., associate professor of surgery at Washington University School of Medicine, preliminary experiments using cells from the pancreas in the McDonnell Douglas electrophoresis device suggest that this technique may bring islet transplantation to the diabetic patient sooner by providing greater quantities of purified beta cells.

This partnership in research by these two functionally different institutions demonstrates a willingness to collaborate their findings for the good of mankind and I commend these efforts which offer new hope for all who suffer from diabetes.●

PASSAGE OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

HON. LES AuCOIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, the August 1 edition of Business Week magazine contains an editorial strongly supporting congressional passage of the equal rights amendment.

I want to commend the editors for calling attention to the pressing need for guaranteeing equal treatment under our laws for women by making this fundamental right part or our Constitution. As the editorial points out, "For both its practical value in anchoring women's rights in the fundamental law of the land and its transcendent symbolic value as an unmistakable national commitment to equality for women, the ERA should become part of the Constitution."

IT'S TIME TO PASS THE ERA

Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex.

These simple words form the basic text of the Equal Rights Amendment, and ERA backers, unbowed by their recent defeat, remain determined to make them part of the Constitution (page 92). The ERA remains highly controversial in many quarters. Yet it is difficult to see how anybody today could be opposed to its intent, which is, quite simply, that women should be treated equally with men before the law. The only legitimate issue is whether accomplishing that increasingly urgent objective requires amending the Constitution.

The answer, essentially, is that equality could indeed be pursued in other ways, such as passing hundreds of individual federal and state laws to remedy inequities as they arise. But trying to right a single, basic wrong by multiple means usually produces mixed results. Federal and State administrations vary in their zeal for equal opportunity. Executive orders depend on the agencies that enforce them. For both its practical value in anchoring women's rights in the fundamental law of the land and its transcendent symbolic value as an unmistakable national commitment to equality for women, the ERA should become part of the Constitution.

In their renewed drive, ERA supporters intend to emphasize the important economic issues, particularly jobs, at stake in its passage. They can produce some persuasive evidence that despite a multitude of laws and executive orders mandating equality, women still face discrimination. In some states, for instance, property acquired after marriage belongs to the husband if the wife has held no paid job. In all states, lingering bias in the workplace, the lender's office, and elsewhere in business leaves women with the short end of the economic stick. Women earn 59¢ for every $1 earned by men. While this is not entirely the result of bias, it suggests that new remedies are needed.

Last spring, even while the ERA ratification drive was failing, polls reported that almost two-thirds of Americans, including business executives, favored its passage. Both morality and the practical need to use all our human resources argue that, this time around, it should pass.●

AMATEUR RADIO ACTIVITIES

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I thought the Members would be interested in the following:

FLOODS, HAMS, AND SCIENCES

(By Irving Zuckerman [1])

A friend phoned me to ask if I still knew about amateur radio activities, and I said, "That depends on what you want to know and why."

HIM. My son has been hearing about radio hams helping in connection with the Midwest floods. He has been interested in aviation up to now, and I am beginning to see the possibility that he might acquire a new interest. What does ham radio activity entail?

ME. The radio hams don't just chat with each other. A ham usually becomes a member of one or more of the emergency communications networks, and when emergencies happen they pitch in. There are about a dozen of those emergency networks, and the ones I recall most readily are American Red Cross, U.S. Weather Bureau, Federal Civil Defense, Amateur Radio Relay League, Military Amateur Radio System, Civil Air Patrol of U.S. Air Force, and Naval Reserve Communications. In fact, your son's interest in aviation might give him some particular interest in Civil Air Patrol amateur radio network, but obviously there is a wide assortment of activities available and he might like more than one of them.

HIM. He will be entering his third year in high school, is that too young?

ME. Not at all. There are any number of radio hams younger than that. He would start having a simple amateur radio transmitter on a sort of "learner's permit" basis. In due course he would want to take the exam for a full-fledged amateur radio license. The exam includes knowledge of functioning radio equipment. While it is not essential that he take a course in physics for a ham license, he might want to elect a physics course in high school for more than one reason.

HIM. Getting back to the Midwest floods, what sort of things have the radio hams been doing out there? My son seems to have heard great things.

ME. The best thing I have on hand is a letter that went into unusual detail. It describes the actual activities of one ham radio club that took place during a Kansas flood a number of years back. It is typical so I will mail a copy to you.

(The following is the letter mailed:)

HI, MERTON: I received your card a few days ago requesting an account of our flood activities here. Boy, we had 'em. But putting them all down on paper is not exactly within my abilities. Maybe you recall the letter I sent in several months ago giving the details on the KVRC 10 meter emergency net drills we were conducting every Sunday night. well, those routing drills every Sunday night paid off in more than money could ever buy.

The club had an authentic emergency run during the regular field day activities. Then on June 29 we had a three day run in which approximately 30 of the club members participated whole-heartedly when the river got to pushing at the tops of the dykes several places.

But the real test came on July 10, having proven ouselves in the previous run, when the Mayor requested we go back into action by 9 PM with at least 3 fixed stations and several mobiles. A special meeting was called and preliminary details worked out on setting up the individual stations and staffing them for the first 24 hours. Besides the 3 fixed stations, we also set up 2 fixed portable stations complete with gasoline powered generators in large panel trucks for continuous duty wherever the need arose away from a source of AC power. With these 5 stations plus 3 mobile units we went into action. Within 24 hours the situation was becoming very critical and we expanded by adding three more fixed stations at the same time keeping from 3 to 6 mobile units in operation continuously. This, remember, was on a 24 hour basis and manpower became a very acute problem. An 8 hour stretch under that kind of strain is rough on the constitution but we were unable to keep any of the watches down to that limit. Most of the boys put in from 12 to 18 hours per stretch, and at one station which became isolated, the boys kept the stations going for 56 hours before relief arrived.

I might add here that several of the boys were hit by the flood damage and at least one took a very heavy loss.

Stations were set up at National Guard headquarters, the city garage, the Fair Grounds, the National Guard headquarters at the scene of the flood, at 4 separate "boat docks" created at several points throughout the city and with a mobile at the city water works plus mobiles scattered wherever needed and requested by the NG or Police Headquarters.

The two major types of traffic handled were requests for "sand, sand bags, trucks and manpower," and the requests for boats to bring people out of the flooded areas. These two types of traffic flowed constantly for four days intermingled with requests for food, motorboat repair parts, mercy missions concerning pets and livestock and Red Cross traffic concerning missing persons locally.

Telephone service was of course extremely critical at all times and the City Water Works and Commercial Power plant were just "nip and tuck" for several days as to whether they could be saved or not.

In addition to the above stations, 3 stations were set up on 75 meters to handle Red Cross, National Guard and Santa Fe RR emergency traffic.

All operations were carried out thru the control station situated at Police Headquarters so that although the traffic was heavy on the frequency, there was a very minimum of interference throughout the entire operation.

We found the job required, most of the time, 4 men at the control station: 2 men at the operating table and two men to coordinute the entire operation. It required a big share of one man's time to keep all stations properly staffed (with two men if possible), and another man's full time to coordiante activities and operations with the Head Office, where all flood activities were being funnelled for proper handling.

We had a private phone at our disposition which we found to be absolutely essential. That sounds odd under the circumstances but it is true and a long story could be written as to why. The Head Office was of course swamped with calls and they soon authorized the Police Switchboard to turn all boat calls over to us for handling. We also handled the ordering of all motorboat gas and repair parts as they would come in thru our facilities anyway. And as long as telephone service was available we made use of it in keeping up our manpower schedules. In this connection we had a large blackboard set up at one end of the room and kept all stations and their current staff plus their relief on the board.

The entire operation was maintained for 5 full 24 hours periods, then tapered off for a day and half before shutting down. It was a big job as far as our club was concerned and it was well done. The Mayor and the National Guard gave us full credit for the job we did as well as the Chief of Police who per-

[1] Economic consultant. Formerly Administrator of Order M-85 for Emergency Radio (Ham) Networks, National Production Authority. Also formerly Assistant Director for Planning and Budget, Office of Coal Research, Interior Department.

sonally made use of our facilities time and again during the emergency.

Every member of the KVRC did all he could to make the operation a success and several amateurs, total strangers to the KVRC and to Topeka showed up from time to time and offered their services. They only had to offer once and they found themselves in the middle of things.

It was certainly a new experience for most if not all of us being involved so closely in a major disaster directly affecting possibly 25,000 people and creating 17 million dollars damage in this area alone to private property and I feel that the amateurs have again come thru with a job "well done" that no other group or organization was set up for or in a position to handle.

MAC.●

PESO CRISIS IN TEXAS

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am submitting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article that illustrates the effect that the crisis of the Mexican peso has had on the economies of Texas border towns. Mexico's debt crisis has hit border towns across Texas and other Southwestern States, particularly because the devaluation of the peso has cut the ability of Mexicans to buy U.S. goods. In the El Paso area, which is in my district, some retail stores had sales drop as much as 80 percent in the last year.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 2, 1983]

PESO CRISIS PLAGUES TEXAS BORDER TOWNS

(By Stuart Auerbach)

From Bronwsville to El Paso, Mexico's debt crisis has spread to the United States, bankers and city officials told Congress' Joint Economic Committee yesterday.

Laredo, between Brownsville and El Paso on Texas' long border with Mexico, suffers from the highest unemployment rate in the country—27.2 percent—because the double devaluation of the peso cut the ability of Mexicans to buy U.S. goods. Some retail stores on the border near El Paso had sales drop as much as 80 percent in the past year.

"While Mexico caught pneumonia last year, the exposed border region had a heart attack," said Sen. Lloyd Bentsen (D-Tex.), who ran the hearing on his state's economic woes.

Things are getting so bad we are contemplating bottled sunshine to sell to the rest of the country," said Cameron County Judge Moises V. Vela of Brownsville. He was one of the four Texas witnesses who detailed the economic problems of the region, which, until the debt crisis hit Mexico last August, prospered from the flow of retail trade and real estate purchases coming from south of the border. In Texas, county judges serve as chief executive officers.

Brownsville banker Robert M. Duffey Jr. said that besides unemployment and business failures, the only economic statistic rising in the border towns is bank deposits—mostly flight capital from Mexicans who have been moving dollars into an American safe haven as fast as they can.

"It's the kind of capital that went to Switzerland from the United States long ago," said Duffey, chairman of the Texas Commerce Bank-Brownsville.

Deposits in his bank have almost doubled since 1980—from $475 million to $850 million in June—and increased by $23 million in the first six months of the year. Mexico's attempts to stop this hemorrhage of dollars appears to be having some effect, as the 1983 increase is far below the $187 million increase in deposits last year.

His biggest problem, though, is finding safe investments for that money.

"We have almost $100 million available for quality extensions of credit, a scenario not unlike our peers in the marketplace. Placing funds in quality loans is, however, a distinct challenge," he told the committee.

The hard times along the Texas-Mexican border stems directly from the sharp devaluation of the peso over the past year. Its value, and therefore its purchasing power, has been cut by about one-sixth, from about 27 pesos to the dollar less than a year ago, nearly 150 pesos to the dollar today.

Vela, the county judge, said retail sales in Brownsville decreased $136 million in the six months from October to last April, with 200 businesses closing down and "many others teetering on the brink of financial disaster." Unemployment stands at 16.1 percent and the city's sales tax income has dropped 42.45 percent in the past year.

Real estate sales, once booming, are so low that some houses stay on the market for as long as six months without even having a prospect take a look at them, said Brownsville banker Duffey.

In El Paso, which, with the Mexican city of Juarez, forms the largest populated area on the border, many retail businesses have closed and unemployment stands at 12.2 percent, banker Merriman Morton said.

"As goes Mexico, so go the American border communities," said El Paso County Judge Pat F. O'Rourke.

The recovery, however, is increasing production in 129 plants set up in Juarez by U.S. companies to assemble products for sale in this country. As a result, the border economy is the strongest within Mexico and "there are positive signs indicating the worst is behind us," said Morton, president of the El Paso National Bank.●

A BILL TO ALLOW A TAX CREDIT FOR EXPENSES INCURRED IN THE CARE OF ELDERLY FAMILY MEMBERS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which grants tax credits for the costs incurred in the care of elderly family members. The amount of the tax credit in this bill would be determined on a sliding scale based on each family's income. Families with an income of up to $25,000 would be eligible for a credit of 30 percent of the elderly relative's medical costs, while families with an income of just under $75,000 would be eligible for a credit of 20 percent, and those families earning more than $75,000 would not qualify for any tax credit. In no case would the tax credit exceed $7,000.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is important for a number of reasons. First of all, it would hold health care costs down. It would do this primarily because it would keep the elderly out of nursing homes—emphasizing home health care for the aged. Second, although it would initially cost the Treasury some revenue, in the long run, it would save money because of the lower medical care costs. With lower health care costs, medicare and other Federal Government medical expenditures would be cut, and this would more than make up for the loss in revenue due to these tax credits. Third, this bill would tend to benefit people more in progressively lower income groups since it involves a tax credit rather than a tax deduction.

This bill is a sound, progressive piece of legislation which would not only make life easier for the elderly of our country, but would reduce health care costs and save Federal Government spending in the long run. Mr. Speaker, I urge that all the Members of this body support this legislation so that we can continue to promote fairness in our health care system without leaving the old folks behind.●

A NATIONAL HOLIDAY IN HONOR OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. WILL BE A LEGACY FOR ALL AMERICANS

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on August 3, 1983, with a mixture of humility and pride, I voted with a majority of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to declare the third Monday of every January a legal holiday to commemorate the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The humility I felt arose from my recognition of the tremendous contributions made to our society and to the world by Dr. King. His struggle on behalf of black Americans evolved into a crusade for all Americans who were unemployed, poorly housed, disenfranchised, uneducated or undernourished.

His famous speech, "I have a Dream", delivered on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, has inspired, and will continue to inspire, generations to pursue the quest for equality and peace. Dr. King supported the basic tenets of our Constitution: the right of equality and freedom for all. Not only was he the Nation's conscience; he restored our sight—he had a vision. He had a dream of equality—equality of rights and opportunities for children,

youth, adults, and the elderly. It was for this dream that Dr. King lived; and it was for this dream that he died.

He honored his fellow citizens by an unwaivering commitment to human rights and human dignity. We now honor him with this special day in order that future generations of Americans may remember him not only as a symbol of freedom and equality in America, but as an individual man—a human being—who lived courageously and fought non-violently for our highest ideals.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to take prompt and positive action to pass this legislation. It is my earnest hope that the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Holiday will be an annual day of renewal and recommitment for Americans.●

DECLINING ACADEMIC STANDARDS

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, I was reading the Douglas Neighbor, a newspaper in my district, and noticed an important editorial on education. Jasper Dorsey wrote that the problem of our schools does not come from too little spending, rather it comes from declining academic standards and a weak disciplinary system.

He clearly points out that increased spending in the past has meant more money to the educational establishment which has been organized against the interests of parents and community groups.

The more I keep in touch with the people in my district, the more I find that they know what they want better than the Washington Establishment does. The education establishment does not like the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education because it threatens its power. Adopting the Commission's report would take the power over our education system away from the education bureacrats and give it to parents who are concerned about giving their children a quality education.

[From the Douglas Neighbor, June 29, 1983]

EDUCATION STANDARDS LARGER PROBLEM THAN SCHOOL FUNDING

(By Jasper Dorsey)

The National Commission on Excellence in Education has started a bandwagon effect throughout the nation.

Not only because most people recognize the "rising tide of mediocrity" in the products of our public schools; but also because the very ones responsible for this terrible condition—the education establishment of teachers unions (like NEA, GEA, and AFT) and administrations, are eagerly jumping on the bandwagon in order to get the "additional billions of dollars" they "need."

Some school administrators are suggesting raising sales taxes, but it is hoped the public will refuse it. Raising performance standards for students and teachers, making course content more rigorous, requiring more homework, returning to four years of English, three of math, and three of physical sciences; combined with making schools more serious and orderly places, does not require lots more money. Just more productivity with what they already have.

In 1966 the nation's schools spent $64 billion. It was increased to $96 billion in 1980; so, the public resistance is strong against extra money when performance got worse, not better.

Parents have been pleading for years with local school boards and administrators to do something about performance. Nothing happens because the Education Establishment believes parents do not know what's best for their children. Only professional educators know, when the truth is they are possibly the worst qualified.

The Commission's Report tells it all. "Liberal education" for 20 years has been redefined by the education establishment without hindrance or restriction until it has reached a point of liberal excesses. Curricula were changed from the basics to pablum and every social movement has been embraced, even more than can be imagined. Discipline was relaxed and dress codes often dropped.

The "reformers" who've been in charge all this time, have flunked the course miserably, as the Commission only says what everyone has known for some time. For what they've done to our children—they have been indicted.

One reason parents have been unable to achieve much is that the Educational Establishment is well organized into those unions for political clout at the local, state and national levels. Parents and public will have to organize for political effectiveness. You'll be amazed at what letters and calls to your elected representatives can do. Especially if you send copies to the editor of this newspaper and others.

The Commission recommended that the school year be extended from 180 days to 220 days; so, some school costs will rise, but not very much. Perhaps as was also recommended, that teachers be paid on a merit basis with "Master Teachers" rewarded more, this could increase expenses, but only to a very small degree. The teacher's unions are already at work against any sort of merit pay, or merit based promotions, as you should expect.

Students and active parents know who the good teachers are. So many teachers and administrators have flunked out, when they've destroyed competence in the name of methodology, rabbit-brained social programs and social promotions. Let's test the teachers again to find out who the incompetents are, before we throw money at the problem.

There will be a violent outcry from the educational establishment against testing teachers, because so many will flunk the tests. In almost each case where its been tried, its been discovered that a majority of the teachers can't read, write or compute either.

Good teachers won't mind being tested, but the incompetent are terrified of it, and for good reason. Low standards are the problem. Not money.●

THE POPULATION EXPLOSION IS NOT FIZZLING

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, in the past year, a number of articles have appeared dramatically trumpeting the end of the population explosion.

Recently, the Christian Science Monitor published an op-ed piece by Robert Fox, senior analyst at the Inter-American Development Bank, and Carl Haub a Washington demographer, which emphatically rebuts those optimistic projections.

I commend this article to my colleagues attention.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 6, 1983]

THE POPULATION EXPLOSION IS NOT FIZZLING

(By Robert Fox and Carl Haub)

Ever since the population "explosion" or "bomb" expression came into use, people have come to us with questions. What does population "explosion" really mean? Is it just another Doomsday prediction dispensed by empty-headed Cassandras? Is it real? Is it over?

Articles have appeared in the past year in major US dailies announcing the end of the population explosion and the averting of demographic collapse. But absolutely nothing has actually happened to warrant such statements.

The facts of population growth are elementary and have remained unchanged for decades; no "new study" has uncovered any startling new evidence of any kind. The current flurry of "fizzle" articles was caused by a 1982 report from the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) which noted the decline in birth rates in some third world countries. The report pointed out that if all countries' birth rates had remained at the rather high level of the 1950s, world population in the year 2000 would be able 7.5 billion (it is about 4.6 billion today).

That statement is true. It is also true that the most recently published UN projection for the year 2000 is 6.1 billion, not 7.5 billion. At this point it is not difficult to see how one can be misled into thinking that world population in 2000 is now expected to be 6.1 billion, down from the 7.5 billion of the "earlier projection." But this is not the case.

The confusion stems from a misinterpretation of UN population projections, a series of projections issued at normally five-year intervals since 1958.

In order to project the future population size of the world's countries, one is faced with the rather knotty problem of guessing what the countries' future birth rates will be. This is no easy task. In most of today's third world countries women have anywhere from five to eight children each. It is, however, generally accepted that as these countries modernize, their fertility behavior will at some point resemble that of today's industrialized countries where women usually have two children or less.

But when will those birth rates fall? And when they fall, how rapid will the the fall be? Will the decrease be swift at first and then lose momentum or vice versa? No one

knows. It would be at least logical to assume that birth rates will exhibit different patterns in different countries depending upon their particular situation.

The UN evaluates each country and makes an educated guess as to just what the timing of its birth rate decline might be and projects populations with that assumption. Then, in order to indicate possible ranges of error in the future, the UN publishes three sets of projections: the "high" variant which assumes the slowest decline in birth rates, the "medium" variant, which assumes a somewhat faster pace, and the "low" variant, which assumes the quickest decline of all. This, of course, results in three possibilities for population in 2000 (the most recent range from the low to the high variant projection being 5.8 [billion] to 6.3 billion). World population in 2000, barring any major calamities such as nuclear war, is expected to fall in that range.

It is a common (though not always totally appropriate) practice to ignore the high and low projections when discussing the future and simply cite the medium or "average" projection for 2000, 6.1 billion. In publishing its projections of world population since the late 1950s, the UN medium projection for 2000 has always hovered in the 6.1 [billion] to 6.5 billion range. Where, then, did the 7.5 billion projection come from?

In 1963, the UN published a fourth illustrative projection along with the high, medium and low series. This projection assumed that all birth rates would remain constant (e.g. "constant fertility"). The projection was intended solely to show what world population would look like if all countries' birth rates remained at the level of the late 1950s, as opposed to what was actually expected.

The "constant fertility" projection of 7.5 billion was never meant to be a baseline against which subsequent actual trends were to be measured. It was fully expected that birth rates would begin to come down in some third world countries before 2000 while others remained high.

The date, the UN projections are "tracking" quite well overall. In 1963, the UN projected a 1980 population of 4.3 billion. When 1980 rolled round the UN estimated a population of 4.4 billion. Not bad considering the gaps in information in 1963.

The fact remains that the Earth entered this century with less than 2 billion population, will close the century with over 6 billion, and will probably reach somewhere between 8 [billion] and 14 billion when population stablizes—that is, if the ecological system permits this to occur. There has been no change in the expectation for decades, and without radical shifts in values, little likelihood of change in the future.●

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON AGING'S FIRST ASSEMBLY CONFERENCE

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the National Council on the Aging has had its first National Assembly Conference. The significant issue this year was: "Redefining the New Federalism—Impact on Low-Income and Other Older Americans."

The purpose of the Assembly was to bring present and past members of the NCOA Board together with other distinguished citizens from all walks of life to discuss the significant issue within the scope of the assembly. In defining the scope, NCOA stated:

The New Federalism of the title incorporates the proposals made by the administration in 1981, 1982, and 1983 to establish new block grants or to make other direct changes in Federal-State working relationships. But the meaning also encompasses all those changes, proposed or actual, that in very direct ways are altering Federal responsibilities related to aging. Thus, funding cutbacks are of concern to the national assembly because they modify the extent and in some cases the very nature of Federal commitment to those programs. Changes in regulatory philosophy must also be included because the power of the Federal executive branch to make rules for the implementation of laws passed by the Congress is of great consequence at all times, but particularly so during a period of rapid governmental change. Finally, the concept of the National Government as largely a negative force that must be taken off the backs of citizens—when expressed by the very leaders of that National Government—is an influence that must be recognized.

Another view of the significant issue of the assembly was set forth by television host Hugh Downs, a member of the NCOA Board and assembly chairperson. He said: "What it boils down to is: What should our National Government be, and what should it do, to promote and protect the well being of its older citizens?"

NCOA listened to speakers who voiced concerns regarding administration policy, but it also listened to the administration's viewpoint from a White House policy formulator, Robert B. Carlson, who has had a direct hand in redefining the New Federalism along the lines sought by a President dedicated to the reduction of the National Government. Assembly members also listened to a representative of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget. Other speakers addressed the fiscal problems among the States and the mutual interests between advocates for aging and advocates for children.

The product of the conference was a 10-page "Statement by the 1983 NCOA National Assembly" and presented to the NCOA leadership. The statement recognizes the seriousness of the current fiscal situation while at the same time calling for fairness and effectiveness in assistance to those most in need of help. As the statement said:

Our objective is not to hold the line, or to keep damage to a minimum, but to move forward in new and positive ways.

In order to share this impressive document with fellow Members of Congress and the American public, I ask unanimous consent to have it reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the attached statement of the National Council on the Aging for the RECORD.

STATEMENT BY THE 1983 NCOA NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

The very low-income and very old elderly, especially minority group members and women living alone, are among those hardest hit by budgetary cutbacks and other actions taken to constrict programs for needy Americans. The NCOA National Assembly—a citizens group reflecting many political and professional viewpoints—is opposed to the reduction of the federal investment in assistance for this population, while recognizing current fiscal difficulties.

This Assembly declares that:

Several features of the 1983 Social Security compromise package stand in need of early rectification. High among them is the provision raising the age for drawing full retirement benefits. An earlier action eliminating minimum benefits should also be reconsidered.

The escalating costs of health care and the deficiencies of the health care delivery system in meeting the needs of older persons making this the time for America to consider carefully a National Health Insurance Program for all generations.

Medicare is rapidly approaching an endangered status. The looming debate over this program should recognize that the alarming rise in costs for this program is caused in large part by the even more alarming rise of health costs in general. Efforts to improve Medicare—and the separate but related Medicaid program—should seek more than damage control; they should be solidly rooted in more general health care reform.

The Administration's rule-making, or regulatory, powers often appear to be at odds with statutory intent. In aging, conflicts have arisen recently, for example, over regulations related to the 1981 Older American Act amendments, hospice coverage through Medicare, and nursing home inspections. The Assembly supports efforts to challenge the de facto denial or diminution of benefits and services that often occur from arbitrary regulatory action.

The "New Federalism" proposed in President Reagan's 1982 State of the Union Message provides a goal for Administration philosophy and direction. The desire of the Executive Branch to transfer certain responsibilities to states must be balanced against an intense fiscal crisis in many states. In addition, the national responsibility to set standards of equity in nationwide programs must be maintained.

Sustained economic recovery cannot be attained through indiscriminate dismantling of programs at a time of growing need. The assembly urges the Congress and the Administration to bring defense costs under control and to examine tax expenditures with a far more critical eye than has been the case in the past. We acknowledge at the same time that the National Council on the Aging and other private sector voluntary organizations have a responsibility to help their members and the general public to understand the significance of defense and tax expenditure issues.

The first National NCOA Assembly, concerned as it is about the specific aging matters set forth in this preamble and the pages that follow, recognizes that organizations representing and serving all age groups must work cooperatively to help each other and the people of our nation to understand the full magnitude of the economic and social changes now in motion.

Our objective is not to hold the line, or keep damage to a minimum, but to move forward in new and positive ways.

ASSEMBLY PRINCIPLES AND DIRECTIONS

The last half century has witnessed the development of programs reflecting the Federal Government's responsibility to understand and improve the circumstances of those older persons in need. The Assembly acknowledges that our government has particular responsibility for those vulnerable persons—both young and older—who, without help, will live lives without essential economic and health security.

Constructive policy modifications are needed to preseve the principles of an effective partnership between the federal and state and local government which will make the nation strong by ensuring that no individual is denied rights and opportunities necessary to the quality of his or her life.

Since 1981, the Administration and the Congress have reduced the federal role largely through reducing or eliminating a number of programs or incorporating them into block grants. In addition, the federal role has been limited not only through legislative channels, but also through administrative and regulatory actions.

The NCOA National Assembly recognizes its responsibility to state the principles that guided its deliberations. They are as follows:

1. The national goals for the elderly set forth in Title I of the Older Americans Act should be reaffirmed and implemented. A caring society ought to be our nation's principal goal.

2. Certain basic right: (a) a floor under income below which no one should fall, (b) access to appropriate health care, (c) safe, decent, appropriate shelter are clear responsibilities of the Federal Government. These basic benefits must be provided in a manner that recognizes the cultural and social diversity of our nation.

3. Essential quality social services should be designed and delivered at the local level and provided by trained, competent people and funded by a partnership of federal, state and local governments, in cooperation with the private sector.

4. The principle of social justice should guide the allocation of national resources and the implementation of programs, with the greatest effort targeted to those who are most vulunerable.

5. Individuals should participate in decisions that affect their lives in order that their dignity will be protected and their personal needs met.

IMPACT OF CHANGE UPON INDIVIDUAL OLDER PERSONS AND THEIR FAMILIES

Disturbing reports are documenting the argument that the very poor older Americans and the very old among them are hardest hit by policy changes directly or indirectly related to aging.

Recent actions of special importance to this group are: reductions in Food Stamp eligibility; cuts in subsidized housing benefits; grants to states for low-income energy assistance; termination of the minimum floor under Social Security for those retiring after January 1, 1982; state actions to adjust Medicaid programs to reduce funding levels; and cutbacks in real dollar funding levels for social services grants and mass transit subsidies by one-third.

All in all, the 1984 Administration proposals would reduce "means-tested" programs to levels nearly $13 billion below the 1983 level and $30 billion below the 1981 level. Adjusted for inflation, this would represent a 40-percent reduction from 1981 levels and a 19-percent reduction from fiscal year 1983 levels.[1]

Such findings challenge Administration statements that the neediest Americans of all ages are unaffected by recent changes in programs designed expressly to rescue them from deep want.

Examples of the impact of changes in other programs, including several without a means test, provide additional information about what is already happening to older persons because of decisions made in 1981-82:

"Housing: In 1981, the Congress lowered the income limit for most housing assistance recipients from 85 percent to 50 percent of the area median, reducing the elderly eligible population by about 32 percent. In addition, tenant rent contributions were increased from 25 percent to 30 percent of adjusted income. According to an Urban Institute study[2] from which these estimates are derived, about 11 percent of those who would have been participating in rental assistance programs in 1983 would be eliminated in the long run, as this rule takes effect.

The Administration's determined efforts to curtail new construction in the public housing programs prompted this comment in a recent report by the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations:

"The elimination of new construction funds effectively halts the provision of specially designed housing projects serving the varied shelter needs of low-income elderly persons. This is being proposed at a time when, for every elderly person receiving rental assistance, there are three who need it, and the wait for HUD units can be three to five years."

Employment and training: In addition to the 26,000 older workers who lost employment with the termination of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, approximately 270,000 other elderly individuals were adversely affected by the loss of CETA because many of the job-holders performed community services important to the elderly.

Older Americans Act and other sources of social services: The Older Americans Act is undergoing an erosion in funding levels at a time of steady inflation in the costs of providing services and increased demand for those services. The much larger Title XX social services program—which includes older persons among the low-income persons it serves—was reduced from $2.9 billion to $2.4 billion when it was redesignated as a block grant in 1981.

Supplemental security income: This cash assistance (SSI) program serves about 1.3 million aged persons and provides in 1983 a monthly payment of $284.30 for an individual and $426.50 for a couple. As the Leadership Council of Aging Organizations (LCAO) points out: "In recent years, SSA has not only wrongfully terminated Social Security and SSI disability benefits for hundreds of thousands of recipients, it has also been improperly denying applications for Social Security and SSI disability benefits." The Assembly applauds the Senate Special Committee on Aging for hearings on the cancellation of Social Security disability benefits, but it also agrees with LCAO on the need for additional Congressional oversight hearings to broaden the inquiry and include a very close look at alleged "savings" resulting from placing new difficulties in the way of those who need SSI benefits for life sustainment.

What does it mean, in human terms, for individuals to be told that they are no longer to be helped? Gross budget statistics provide only the most abstract information on that subject. For example, approximately 187,000 older persons were served by Legal Service Corporation Offices in 1981, but a 25 percent reduction was imposed in 1982. This could mean that more than 46,000 of those persons no longer received help. In addition, LSC offices closed; experienced staff left; and uncertainties intensified when in early 1983 the proposed budget called for elimination of legal services entirely on the grounds that such services could be provided through an already overburdened block grant program. Another example: The Low Income Weatherization Program had $400 million to work with in 1981, but this was down to $144 million in the current fiscal year.

Can block grants take up the slack left by the abolition or draining of individual programs? Typically, block grant regulations do not demand detailed categorical accounting of their activities to the Federal Government. An attempt by a House Committee on Aging Subcommittee in 1982 to determine how older persons were faring under the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) established in 1981, for example, yielded only fragmentary information. This led the Subcommittee chairman to declare that the total effect of the SSBG was to cut up the federal dollar into 50 pieces, one for each state. The only thing asked in return was a state plan outlining the intended use for the dollars once every two years. Those states that were maintaining records on the number of elderly persons served reported that the homebound and the health-impaired elderly were the most hard hit by funding reductions imposed when the block grant was established.

The NCOA Assembly cannot fully reply to the question: How are older persons affected by those cutbacks and program cancellations that have already occurred? It is difficult to track, in detail, the interactions that occur among stricken programs and people. The NCOA Assembly asks for organized monitoring of the human cost of two years of cutbacks.

The conclusion of these findings is clear: The Federal Government is turning its back on its responsibility to individuals, especially those in greatest need. We strongly disagree with this change in political philosophy and recommend that the Federal Government return to acceptance of responsibility for the general welfare by achieving fiscal savings in, among others, this defense budget and "tax expenditures."

MEDICARE, MEDICAID, AND HEALTH COSTS

Medicare is an important fact of life for the 26 million aged persons it covers. The decision in 1965 to establish such a program recognized that entire families were financially and emotionally endangered when the eldest of their members could not afford to go to a hospital or a doctor, thus becoming more likely to have worse physical problems later on.

There can be no substitute for the goals of Medicare. Thus far, the present Administration has dealt with Medicare almost totally

[1] According to NCOA Assembly speaker Robert Greenstein, Director of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Washington, D.C.

[2] "Housing Assistance for Older Americans—The Reagan Prescription," by James P. Zais, Raymond J. Struyk, and Thomas Thibodeau, October 1982.

in fiscal terms. There is no discussion of its objectives, only of its costs. The consequence is a cavalcade of cuts or proposed cuts in coverage either through raising the costs of participation in the program or by reducing eligibility in one way or another. The centerpiece of the proposed Medicare budget actions for 1984, for instance, is so-called catastrophic coverage that would give important new protection, but only to six-tenths of 1 percent of all Medicare beneficiaries. In return, the overwhelming majority of medicare beneficiaries who use its hospital coverage would pay approximately $630 instead of the $304 they now pay for a typical Medicare hospital stay. We oppose this proposal. In addition, we absolutely are opposed to a means test for Medicare, or any program restriction that would limit participation on the basis of income or assets. The Assembly, however, supports the concept of prospective payment as a means of controlling health care costs, while maintaining quality.

It is clear, however, that all the ingenious schemes that can be thought of to reduce eligibility and benefits will not provide the answer to the high cost of Medicare. It is significant, and regrettable, that the Administration has failed to launch across-the-board cost-saving strategies for the entire health care system. Medicare cannot change the current drift and mounting costs of that system because it is part of it, not its driving force. The cost of health care has increased three times the cost of living in this country. We support the need for hospital and medical provider cost containment while protecting quality of care. We also support the goal that all physicians accept Medicare assignment.

The NCOA Assembly believes that the American public is not sufficiently aroused by the health care inflation issue to insist on leadership at the national level in dealing with it. The NCOA Assembly further believes that older persons themselves are as much affronted by the startling hospital and medical bills they often receive as would any consumer who must pay bills through private insurance of household budgets. The Assembly recommends that steps be taken to help older Americans join in a citizens' effort to monitor and control such costs. In addition, the Assembly reiterates its desire for a broadened Medicare, one that will include long-term care coverage including improved home health services, adult daycare and such individual additions to its protection as reimbursement for eyeglasses, prescription drugs, catastrophic care and dental care. We propose encouragement for demonstration of Health Maintenance Organizations with their built-in incentive for prevention. This could be a sensible interim step to a national health insurance program for all age groups.

This nation simply must have national insurance to protect against illness costs through the life cycle and especially in the later years of life, if it is to qualify as a civilized society. We are hopeful that Congress will provide this protection either through a national health insurance or a program specifically for older people, as in Medicare.

Medicaid, the program established 18 years ago to assure that needy Americans of all ages would not lack health care, now accounts for more than $32 billion, in federal and state expenditures. In some important ways, it is more helpful to its elderly participants than Medicare, since it is the major vehicle for nursing home reimbursement. It generally covers other important costs that Medicare does not, including prescription drugs, hearing aids, eyeglasses, and dental care.

But since states have considerable leeway in determining what services shall actually be provided, and how eligibility shall be determined, the service provision patterns vary considerably throughout the nation. We consider it to be the role of the Federal Government to develop the basic standards for Medicaid that social justice dictates. Individual cutback actions were already underway before the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981, but they have accelerated since then. Among the consequences are new limitations on the number of hospital services, duration of hospital stays, reductions in nursing home beds available and reserved bed days and allowable reimbursement, elimination of eyeglasses and certain covered prescription drugs, and reduction of podiatric and dental services.

Medicaid has long been criticized for overreliance on institutional care—largely in nursing homes—for long-term illness among older Americans. There is some reason to hope that this situation is changing, thanks to positive response by many states to a 1981 legislative provision allowing states more flexibility in using Medicaid funds for home care and other services outside of institutions. But this forward step is taken at a time when the federal matching rate to the states has been reduced approximately $1 billion annually since fiscal year 1982. States are hard put to serve the 3.5 million persons on their rolls and other demands on Medicaid's hardpressed resources. It does not help matters for the Administration to suggest to states that they collect part of the nursing home costs from younger family members of elderly patients; this outmoded thinking about filial relationships is more wishful thinking than decent or practical policy, particularly in view of the fact that many elderly in nursing homes have no family. It does not help, either, to propose that Medicaid participants—by definition, destitute—should make copayments for services on the grounds that this will help finance the system.

Again, the Assembly points to the fundamental cause of the high cost of Medicaid: As with Medicare, the program is the victim of the larger deficiencies in our health care system, not the cause of them.

The time has come to face up to fact that overall health care reform is needed. This may well include steps to bring a genuine long-term health care program under the Medicare mantle of social health insurance: The National Assembly places high priority on this possibility. It also calls for close federal scrutiny of actions that states are taking to reduce health costs. The Assembly emphatically states that the Federal Government should require states to participate in a health planning process.

CAPABILITIES OF STATES, LOCALITIES, AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR TO MEET NEW CHALLENGES

The National Governors' Association, in its most recent statement on this issue declared: "The fiscal condition of the states at the end of 1982 was bleaker than at any time in recent memory."

Causes of the dire budgetary situation in most states were described as (1) a recession-induced drain on expected revenues and (2) an increase in the public's need for services.

Consequently, according to NGA, many states faced budget deficits, despite statutes or traditions that require balanced budgets. Thirty-two states had to enact new taxes or increase existing tax rates in 1982 and early in 1983. A majority of states reported that fiscal issues—such as balancing their budgets, reducing state spending, or preventing budget deficits—were their number one concern.

Another report—issued by the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees in January 1983—estimated that in fiscal year 1982, state governments lost more than $13 billion as a result of federal budget cuts. It was estimated that the loss will surpass $24 billion by 1984.

These recent actions or estimates should not overshadow the fact that significant cutbacks in human service programs were occurring at both state and local levels prior to 1981. The example set by California's Proposition 13, five years ago, has been followed in varying degrees elsewhere.

Municipalities, too, are sounding alarm signals. The United States Conference of Mayors reported in 1982 that 70 percent of cities polled said they were not fairly represented in federal distribution of funds under block grants enacted in 1981. In 55 cities, human service programs were being severely cut at a time when demand for them was increased by unemployment and other stresses caused by national recession. A Congressional survey last October found that cities were increasing the property tax—one of the targets of earlier citizens' campaigns for lower governmental levies to help make up losses in federal revenue.

Private sector

The NCOA National Assembly has a special appreciation of the work done by the 100,000 private nonprofit service organizations of this nation, including especially the contributions of a cadre of volunteers that supports their efforts. The National Council on the Aging has many such agencies among its members, and NCOA has long worked to strengthen the effectiveness of this sector in its service to older Americans. But the NCOA Assembly, as well as NCOA, must face the following facts as reported recently by the Urban Institute:

In 1981, such organizations received about 40 percent of their income from federal sources; this was more than the percentage received from all of private giving combined, whether from individuals (exclusive of giving for sacramental religious purposes), corporations, or foundations.

But Administration budget proposals would reduce the income available to nonprofits by an estimated $35 billion (1981 dollars) between fiscal year 1981 and fiscal year 1985, or a reduction of one-fifth in the amount that normally could have been expected from federal sources.

Simply to hold constant the real value of the nonprofits' resources in the face of proposed federal cutbacks, private charitable contributions would have to jump over $4 billion or 22 percent in 1982, and an average of more than $13 billion or 40 percent annually from 1983-85.

The National Assembly must regard the information received from the states, localities, and the nonprofit sector as tangible evidence that budgetary decisions made at the federal level are having largely undocumented consequences elsewhere. The Assembly welcomes the positive response that has been taken in many states in finding new tax resources to help persons who might otherwise be abandoned. The Assembly also expects the nonprofit sector to continue to express its vitality and usefulness in new and hopefully ingenious ways. But

the Assembly, here again, must ask: How can we as a society, record the changes that are occurring in terms of their effects on individual human beings? Can we arrive at clear-cut, feasible ways in which governments and voluntary agencies can work together, not in terms of pendulum swings from "big government" to "decentralized" government, but in terms of a national effort drawing from all sources of funding, concern, and creativity in helping the elders and others of this nation to enjoy their full potential throughout their lives? The question should receive continuing attention by NCOA.

WOMEN AND MINORITIES

Historically, the Federal Government has acted as the primary arbiter of the rights of all citizens and the ensurer of equality of opportunity. We hear little from the New Federalism concerning this role. In fact, the impact of the New Federalism on older women and elderly members of the nation's minorities is severe, harsh and disheartening.

To support that conclusion, a few brief—and unpleasant—facts:

Median income in 1981 for 65-plus women was about 58 percent of men's income, $4,757, as compared to $8,173. This is often due to nonparticipation in the job market, and lower rates of pay.

The majority of older persons are women, two-thirds of the 75-plus population are women, and most older women are widowed and/or living alone.

Black women are five times more likely to be in poverty than White men. Women of Hispanic origin have a poverty rate of 27.4 percent as compared to 16.2 percent for White women. The poverty rate for 65 plus-black women is 43.5 percent.

All older Blacks and Hispanics are far more likely to be living in or near poverty than the 22.6 level for Whites. For older Hispanics, the total is nearly 41 percent; for older Blacks, 53.6 percent.

A poverty and near-poverty level of well over 40 percent for older persons of Pacific Asian and Native American heritage are equally discouraging.

Thus, these groups are more likely than others to be critically affected when a minimum Social Security benefit is denied to future retirees, when cost of living increases are delayed, or when reductions are made in help provided through such programs as Food Stamps, the Supplemental Security Income Program, public and other low-income housing, and employment and training opportunities.

Thus far, there is no evidence of the ability of states and local governments to ensure that the minimum survival needs of older women and minority older persons can be met under the New Federalism. The federal posture has placed the responsibility for skill training, for example, at the door of states and local boards of education, and these boards often fail to meet the needs for new and necessary skills required by older women.

Block grants that eliminate the direct access of Native American tribes to the Federal Government are a violation of Indian treaties and rights.

This Assembly recommends that all citizens require officials at every level to analyze the impact of any program changes on the poor, the elderly and minorities. We assert that those older, poor, widowed minority persons who are already in triple or quadruple jeopardy ought not to be called upon to bear any greater burden.

CONCLUSION

The National Assembly is impressed with an NCOA editorial which appeared early in the present Administration. It called for defense of "the modest and real gains of the prior two decades among the most vulnerable Americans." Yet it added:

"Which is not to say that we need to defend every creaking Federal initiative of whatever efficacy. Overlaps should be unsnarled, obsolete subsidies phased out, windfall benefits ended, and eligibility rules enforced * * * Similarly, cuts that merely transfer burdens to others are a sham and must be resisted."

This even-handed, comprehensive, and alert stance must be maintained not only by NCOA and other aging advocates, but by all persons who care about the quality and decency of the society in which they live.

This National Assembly statement has been devoted largely to misgivings. We are alarmed by clearcut injustices that are occurring during a period of rapid governmental and social change grouped under the heading of New Federalism. The other side of the coin is the fact that NCOA has always found, in changing circumstances, new stimulus for creative response, not only on the part of government, but on the part of all caring citizens. The present difficulties can be turned to good effect, ultimately, if they sharpen our appreciation of the fundamental goal NCOA seeks in aging: The best possible kind of life for all our citizens through all their years.●

H.R. 2780, STATE AND LOCAL FISCAL ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1983

HON. DENNY SMITH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2780, which passed the House of Representatives on August 2, reauthorizes the general revenue-sharing program which is scheduled to expire by September 30 of this year. While I understand the problems of local governments in trying to provide services where Federal funds have been cut, I voted against the bill.

When the bill was reported from committee, the authorization period was for 5 years. I felt this should be changed to a 3-year authorization. Considering the uncertainties in the current economic climate, it is difficult to know the needs of State and local governments several years from now, or for that matter, the fiscal status of the Federal Government. I simply think it makes more sense, in the event the general revenue-sharing program is reauthorized, that the timetable be for only 3 years allowing Congress an opportunity to review the program to see if it is being adequately funded and if those funds are being efficiently used. An amendment making this change was passed by the House.

I believe the Government Operations Committee failed to act in a fiscally responsible manner in recommending an increase in the reauthorization over its prior level. The 1980 reauthorization provided for $4.6 billion per year for local governments but provided no fiscal year 1981 funds for the States. State governments were authorized $2.3 billion in each of fiscal year 1982 and 1983, but funding was made subject to appropriations. H.R. 2780, as reported from committee, entitled local governments to a total of $5.3 billion a year. I could not support the 16 percent increased funding for local governments which was also $281 million above the funding level assumed in the First Budget Resolution. This type of disregard for the budget process, not recognizing huge budget deficits, is what has gotten us into the financial straits this country is currently facing. Fortunately, the House passed an amendment reducing the funding for local governments to the level recommended in the First Budget Resolution; nevertheless, the House defeated a measure which I supported that would have reduced the reauthorization to its prior level.

I believe that with an unemployment rate higher than 10 percent, we should be looking at the Davis-Bacon Act and how it affects the unemployment rate. The House rejected an amendment that would have allowed Treasury to waive the Davis-Bacon requirements if recipients demonstrate that paying lower wages would enable them to employ a significantly large number of workers. I supported this amendment as a needed part of the legislation.

Even though the House adopted several amendments needed to make this legislation conform to the administration's request, I still believe the program has been ill-conceived and poorly managed. There are many worthwhile Government programs I would like to support but the spending seems endless—and I recognize the pinch on the budgets of local governments—but the fact remains that I fail to see the wisdom of sharing revenue that the Federal Government simply does not have.●

THE PALISADES PEACE CENTER: A FOCAL POINT FOR PEACE

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, in these times of world peril and global conflict our search for world peace can never end. The terrifying spectre of nuclear war continues to haunt us. We must face the stark reality that we all live under the constant threat of world destruction and human extinction.

We as public officials have an important role to play in this search. We must do all that we can to insure that this generation, and future generations, will not be cast into the dark shadow of nuclear holocaust.

Through the passage of a nuclear freeze resolution in the House and by adopting a sane and sensible approach to our defense budget and arms control policy we have been attempting to do our share.

But our efforts are not enough. People throughout the country must join in this effort. In my district, Bergen County, N.J., a group of concerned people are becoming involved in the pursuit of peace. Churches and community centers throughout the country are being dedicated as forums for promoting the cause of world peace. They have become meeting points for people who wish to exchange thoughts, ideas, and hopes about world peace.

On Sunday, May 29, 1983, I had the honor of participating in the dedication of one of these peace centers. The Nuclear Freeze Committees of Cliffside Park and Fort Lee, N.J., in conjunction with members of New Jersey SANE, joined together in dedicating the Grantwood Congregational Church of Cliffside Park as the Palisades Peace Center. Residents, public officials and clergyman from surrounding communities all attended the ceremony and offered their support for the center as a symbol of a continuing commitment to peace. The Palisades Peace Center has now become the focal point for those in neighboring communities concerned about peace and the future of our planet.

John F. Kennedy once said:

> Peace is a daily, a weekly, a monthly process, gradually changing opinion, slowly eroding old barriers, quietly building new structures. And however undramatic the pursuit of peace, the pursuit must go on.

Through peace centers like this, the pursuit of peace will, indeed, go on.●

REINVESTING IN OUR FUTURE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I introduced House Resolution 255 in June, expressing the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should award, posthumously, the Presidential Medal of Freedom to the late Willard F. Libby. At that time, I outlined some of the many contributions Dr. Libby has made to our science community, through the advancement of several technologies and through the advancement of science education.

Dr. Libby has made an outstanding contribution to our country. I greatly respect and admire his dedication to his work. If more of us accomplished even a portion of the breakthroughs Dr. Libby achieved during his career, we would greatly reduce the problems our society is facing today.

For years, I have been coming to this floor to request, encourage, and even demand that this House support research. I am convinced the only way to resolve future crises and catastrophies is by continuing research, developing new technologies, and helping solve with science the critical situations which could conceivably diminish our quality of life.

In recent years, there have been many examples of how new technologies have improved our lives. Through research, we have created a space program, giving us capabilities which surpass even our greatest hopes of just a century ago. We can now have virtually instantaneous communication, via satellite, with any communication center in the world. We can better predict and monitor the weather. We can locate forest fires, minerals, water deficiencies, and even crop damage.

And these technologies have been applied to other fields. Almost every profession has been able to use technologies developed within the space program to enhance its own programs. None of these breakthroughs would have been possible if we, as a nation, had not invested in research profits from our past inventions.

I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention an area of science from which I would like to reinvest a portion of its benefits into research and education. I mentioned in my previous statement that Dr. Libby, although he has been recognized as the inventor of the diffusion barrier, a technology which is still being utilized to process fuel for light water reactors throughout the free world, had never received a return on his research because the Federal Government retained the rights to it.

For this reason, I am introducing today legislation which would divert a portion of fiscal year 1985 revenues from the Uranium project, a project made possible through Dr. Libby's research, to be returned to the research field. This money, $25 million, would be placed in the Willard F. Libby Energy Science Fund, and would be used for energy science research grants. Outstanding scholars would be recommended by the Willard F. Libby Foundation, an educational foundation formed to continue the interests of Willard F. Libby.

While Dr. Libby was on the forefront of many projects, and helped to develop many new technologies, he did not lose sight of the need for continuing education. During his career, he designed a program for a degree of doctor of the environment, of which there are now 60 graduates. He also trained 102 Ph. D. chemists and taught more than 2,000 graduate and undergraduate students. His insight into the need for education and the initiation of newly trained professionals into his field sets an example we all should follow. For this reason, I would like to encourage the careful consideration of this legislation.

A BILL To authorize a grant to the Willard Frank Libby Foundation for energy and science related research grants, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is authorized to be granted to the Willard Frank Libby Foundation, a foundation created in honor of Dr. Willard Frank Libby, a distinguished and outstanding scientist, especially in the field of nuclear fuel enrichment processes, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, for the establishment of a Willard Frank Libby Energy Sciences Research Grant Program to make research grants in the fields of energy and science to scholars selected by such Foundation, and also for use in the administration of such program and in the administration of the Foundation.

(b) Funds for the grant authorized by subsection (a) of this Act shall be derived from revenues received by the United States from the enrichment of uranium.●

NO CHANGE IN INCOME GAP BETWEEN RACES

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an interesting and disturbing article by John Herbers that appeared in the July 18 New York Times. It describes how the income gap between blacks and whites in the United States is as wide now as it was in 1960.

While many blacks may have entered the ranks of the middle class and have attended college, the income earned by black college graduates is about the same as that earned by white high school graduates. The sad fact, as the article points out, is "that the income gap between blacks and whites is less related to education than to the job opportunities open to blacks once they have completed their education."

It is imperative that all persons have equal access to the job market, regardless of race. I urge the President and the members of the Commission on Civil Rights to do all that is within their power to eradicate any color bars to employment opportunities. We in Congress must hold the administration accountable to insure that appro-

priate action is taken to lessen the economic disparity between blacks and whites that is caused by unequal access to job opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article for the RECORD and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, July 18, 1983]

INCOME GAP BETWEEN RACES WIDE AS IN 1960, STUDY FINDS

(By John Herbers)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The gap between the average incomes of whites and blacks is as wide today as it was in 1960, primarily because the proportion of black families headed by women rose from one-fifth to nearly one-half and the proportion of black men with jobs dropped sharply in that period.

Those were the principal findings of the first nonpartisan, comprehensive report on the status of blacks since the 1980 census and subsequent data were published. The study was conducted by the Center for the Study of Social Policy, a private research group headed by a Nixon Administration official.

EDUCATION NEARLY EQUAL

The study shows that black and white families were, on the whole, better off than in 1960, largely because both parents work in so many more families nowadays. In fact, black families in which the husband and wife work increased their earnings at a faster rate than did white families.

The study showed that the educational level of blacks climbed so fast over the last two decades that it is now very close to that of whites. That has generated the movement of many blacks into the middle class, although the income earned by black college graduates is about the same as that earned by white high school graduates.

But those gains were offset by the large number of black families in which there is not a husband present to earn money. Fourteen percent of white families with children under 18 are headed by women, while 47 percent of black families are in that category, up from 8 percent in 1950 and 21 percent in 1960.

The problem is compounded, the study showed, by the fact that only 55 percent of black men over the age of 16 are employed today, as against 74 percent in 1960.

As a consequence, the median income of black families in 1981 was 56 percent of the whites' median. In 1960, the figure was 55 percent; the difference of one percentage point is statistically insignificant.

WOMEN AND POVERTY

The report said that families headed by women were nearly twice as likely to be poor as two-parent families, regardless of race, and that half of all black families headed by women had incomes below the poverty line.

"Despite the fact that black Americans have made some gains since the civil rights movement," the report said "the economic gap between blacks and whites remains wide and is not diminishing. On measures of income, poverty and unemployment, wide disparities between blacks and whites have not lessened or have even worsened since 1960."

The sharp rise in the proportion of black families headed by women "increases the likelihood that black families will be poor and also greatly increases the chances that children in these families will live in poverty," the report said.

"BLEAK FIX" OF BLACKS CITED

Tom Joe, the director of the Center for the Study of Social Policy and the principal author of the report, said information for the study had come from generally available public documents that had not been brought together before for a nonpartisan study. Mr. Joe, an offical of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in the Nixon Administration, said it was the "cumulative effect" of the statistics that persuaded him of their importance.

M. Carl Holman, president of the National Urban Coalition, commented in an interview that many people, including some black leaders, were unaware of the "bleak fix" of poor blacks. The report, he said, raises "some very, very serious implications" for the future.

Disclosure of increasing economic polarization among blacks comes as the nation is sharply divided over what to do about chronic poverty and unemployment.

Most black leaders and many whites believe the Federal Government, through its welfare and social programs, has not done enough to help poor blacks recover from historical discrimination. On the other hand, President Reagan, a number of former liberal scholars and a few black leaders say the social programs of the past two decades have created a crippling dependency among poor blacks.

The unemployment of almost half the adult black males is directly related to the rapid rise in the number of households headed by women, officials say. Twenty years ago, three of every four black men were employed. But as more and more have become jobless, the burden of raising families has fallen on women, many of whom are on welfare. In many states, two-parent families are not eligible for welfare.

HIGHER JOBLESS RATE PRESUMED

Paul Smith, a statistician with the Children's Defense Fund, said that, in addition to the men counted in the statistics who have no jobs, about 15 to 20 percent of black men aged 20 to 40 could not be found by the Census Bureau and are presumed to have neither jobs nor permanent residences. This probably means, he said, that more than half of black adult males do not have jobs. Black women, on the other hand, have experienced no decline in employment.

Mr. Smith noted that in 1970, 62 percent of black women over 18 were married and that by 1981 the percentage had dropped to 48. Married women are having fewer children, in part, because most of them work, while an ever-increasing proportion of black children are born to single women, he said.

The data used for the report were collected for the most part before President Reagan took office in January 1981, and thus no conclusions could be drawn from them about the effect of his Administration's programs on blacks.

Highlights of the study, which was supported by the New World Foundation and the Field Foundation, follow.

INCOMES

Median family income for both blacks and whites has increased over two decades. In 1960 the black median, measured in 1981 dollars to account for inflation, was $9,919, compared with $17,259 for whites. By 1961 the figures were $13,266 for blacks and $23,517 for whites.

In the 1960's the disparity between black and white media incomes decreased, so that by 1970, black income as a percent of white income had risen to 61 percent from 55 percent. But in the next decade most of that gain was lost, and in 1981, median black income was 56 percent of that for white families.

Mr. Joe said neither regional differences in incomes nor other methods of computing incomes would make any substantial difference in that outcome.

Many black familes improved their incomes over the two decades. The report said, for example, that in 1968 black families in which two parents worked had an income 73 percent as large as white families in the same category. By 1981, those black families were earning 84 percent of the white earnings.

But that was the exception. Fifty-four percent of black families are now at income levels below $15,000 a year, compared with 28 percent of white families.

"Since black, female-headed households are the most rapidly increasing proportion of all black families, the fact that they have not gained economic ground has more than offset the increases made by other types of black families," the report said.

EDUCATION

Over two decades, blacks consistently outstripped whites in terms of educational gains. Between 1960 and 1981, for example, black males made a gain of 4.4 years of schooling on the average, compared with 1.9 years for white males.

"By 1981, the median level of schooling for both black males and females was above 12 years, and the difference between white and black years of schooling was only half a year," the report said.

Further, the illiteracy rate for blacks has dropped very rapidly until there is now little difference between blacks and whites in the ability to read; since 1968, school dropout rates have decreased for blacks while remaining relatively constant for whites, and rates of college enrollment for blacks have increased dramatically.

The financial rewards for education, however, "are far different for the two groups," the report said. For example, 47 percent of blacks with four years or more of college earned $20,000 to $40,000 a year, while the same percentage of whites with no more than high school education earned incomes in that range.

The figures suggest, the report said, "that the income gap between blacks and whites is less related to education than to the job opportunities open to blacks once they have completed their education."

EMPLOYMENT

There was a sizable increase in the percentage of blacks employed in professional, technical, managerial, sales, craft and other jobs from which they had often been barred before the 1960's. For example, blacks increased their share of managerial and administrative jobs to 9.9 percent from 7.2 percent in the years from 1972, when affirmative action laws for hiring minorities began to take hold, to 1981.

The unemployment ratio between blacks and whites, however, has remained virtually unchanged over the two decades: roughly two to one. But there was a large increase in black males over the age of 16 who were no longer looking for work and thus were not counted in the unemployment statistics. As a result, about 45 percent of black men do not have jobs, and if those who cannot be found by the Census Bureau are added, conservative estimates put the proportion of black men without jobs at more than half.

By comparison, the percentage of white males over 16 without jobs was about 30 percent. And white women increased their employment dramatically. In 1960, 35 percent of white women held jobs. By 1982 the percentage had risen to 48.

The plight of black males becomes clearer, the report said, when looked at in raw numbers: "Between 1960 and 1982, the black male population over age 16 nearly doubled, from 5.6 million to 10.73 million. But the number of employed black males increased by only 1.79 million, from 4.15 million to 5.94 million. Thus, the number of unemployed black males grew by 3.34 million during this period."

POVERTY

Black children are particularly affected by poverty. In 1959, 66 percent of blacks under 18 were in homes below the Government-defined poverty level. By 1981 the percentage had declined to 45. For whites under 18 in poverty, in 1959 the percentage was 21, and in 1981 it had declined to 15. Thus, black youths remained about three times more likely to live in poverty than whites.

Failure to narrow the gap was due in large part to the fact that so many black children live in households headed by women, rather than in the relatively wealthier two-parent households, the report said.

"By 1981, female-headed families represented 47.1 percent of all black families with children," it said. "Since these are the families most likely to be in poverty—1.7 times as likely as all families to be poor—this change in family composition increases the likelihood that black families will be poor and also greatly increases the chances that children in these families will live in poverty."

Copies of the report, entitled "A Dream Deferred: the Economic Status of Black Americans, a working paper" may be obtained for $10 apiece from the Center for the Study of Social Policy, 236 Massachusetts Ave., Washington, D.C. 20002.●

CODE OF ETHICS FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to salute the Federal employees in my district. This is the 100th anniversary year marking the inception of our U.S. Civil Service. They deserve credit for maintaining a continuing tradition of outstanding service to their country.

On January 16, 1883, President Chester A. Arthur signed into law the Pendleton Act which established positions in the Government which were predicated upon the merit of the individuals selected to fill such positions. This eliminated over a century of the spoils system in Government jobs.

During the century since the creation of today's civil service as we know it, Federal workers have become a finely honed and dedicated group of professionals.

On a number of occasions, this office has inquiries which require immediate responses. In almost every instance, when we have had to respond to the needs of our constituency, wherein problems require that we contact Federal agencies in the field after working hours, we have consistently found someone there to respond.

There is a Code of Ethics for Government Services to which these Federal employees subscribe and by which they govern their daily service to their country. It is with a deep sense of pride that I commend our Federal employees. In furtherance of these remarks, I wish to make their creed a part of the RECORD at this time.

CODE OF ETHICS FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Any Person In Government Service Should:

Put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department.

Uphold the Constitution, laws, and legal regulations of the United States and all governments therein and never be a party to their evasion.

Give a full day's labor for a full day's pay; giving to the performance of his duties his earnest effort and best thought.

Seek to find and employ more efficient and economical ways of getting tasks accomplished.

Never discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not; and never accept, for himself or his family, favors or benefits under circumstances which might be construed by reasonable persons as influencing the performance of his governmental duties.

Make no private promises of any kind binding upon the duties of office, since a Government employee has no private word which can be binding on public duty.

Engage in no business with the Government, either directly or indirectly, which is inconsistent with the conscientious performance of his governmental duties.

Never use any information coming to him confidentially in the performance of governmental duties as a means for making private profit.

Expose corruption wherever discovered.

Uphold these principles, ever conscious that public office is a public trust.

(This Code of Ethics was agreed to by the House of Representatives and the Senate as House Concurrent Resolution 175 in the Second Session of the 85th Congress. The Code applies to all Government Employees and Office Holders.)●

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF NASA

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, we are celebrating the 25th anniversary of the NASA space program this year, and in conjunction with this celebration of the achievements of those years, I would like to submit for the RECORD an article from the Christian Science Monitor by Robert C. Cowen. This article outlines the early years of our space program. It indicates the directions we could have taken and provides us with a measuring stick of just how much we have been able to achieve in those years. Mr. Cowen is able to give us a sense of the programs past as well as an indication of the possibilities of the future.

As chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, I have had the pleasure of closely watching the growth of the NASA space program. I hope that this article will allow my colleagues to share in the celebration of the 25 years NASA has given to the area of research and development of our capabilities in space operations.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 29, 1983]

(By Robert C. Cowen)

(Fueled by a nation's dreams, NASA mobilized scientists and engineers to meet the challenges of space. Within 25 years of its founding, it had helped humanity gain a new perspective on Earth.)

Earth is a planetary jewel. Abundantly watered, teeming with life, it is unique in the solar system. Yet it is no anomaly. It has a scientifically logical place in the sun's family of planets.

But throughout their evolution, human beings have lived too close to home to fully appreciate Earth's planetary role. It has taken the Olympian view of a weather satellite, the homeward glance of a moon explorer, or the first geological survey of Mars to give us a more cosmic perspective.

This new dimension that spaceflight brings to human experience may be the most important dividend of the first quarter-century of the US National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

We tend to take NASA for granted now. Yet when President Eisenhower signed the National Aeronautics and Space Act on July 29, 1958, an organization unique among US federal agencies was born.

It was charged with developing space technology, expanding scientific knowledge of the solar system and the universe, aiding national defense, and fostering international cooperation in peaceful space ventures. Alone among federal agencies, it also was required by law to "provide for the widest practicable and appropriate dissemination of information concerning [its] activities and the results thereof."

In other words, all humanity was to share the benefits of the new perspective.

It is a mandate that has brought the benefits of orbital weather observations and satellite communications around the world. It enables other nations to use US satellites to map their own resources. It has allowed scientists from many lands to join in space research. It has made the fruits of that research widely available to everyone through an open public relations program and NASA's own books, films, and pamphlets. It even helps schoolchildren share the adventure of space science by flying their experiments on the shuttle.

This is a unique achievement in a contentious world. Indeed, the US space program might well have turned out to be much more restrictive.

Ironically, it took the action of the Soviet Union to produce the NASA marvel.

SPUTNIK CATCHES THE U.S. NAPPING

The agency was born of the turmoil that followed the surprise appearance of the first Soviet satellite, Sputnik 1, Oct. 4, 1957. The United States was caught napping, although it did not seriously lag behind the Soviets in space capability.

The US had a vigorous rocketry program. This was being used to develop military missiles and, to a much lesser extent, to explore Earth's upper atmosphere. The country also was preparing to launch its own scientific satellite in Project Vanguard. This was a contribution to the program of the International Geophysical Year, as was Sputnik 1. Indeed, the United States could have beaten the Soviets into orbit had Wernher von Braun's Army missile team been allowed to do so. (It was restrained in favor of the Vanguard effort.) The von Braun team underscored this point by orbiting the first US satellite—Explorer 1—on Jan. 31, 1958, after the first Vanguard rocket had exploded on the pad.

Nevertheless, as pointed out by the late Homer Newell, former associate administrator of NASA and a NASA historian, "Had it not been for the shock generated by Sputnik, the American space program would probably have evolved into one largely devoted to military objectives—with space science as an adjunct."

In his history of US space science ["Beyond the Atmosphere": NASA publication SP; 4211], Dr. Newell explains that, after Sputnik, "a strong quick response was deemed essential. . . . The United States was competitive in space even as the country deplored its loss of leadership. Leadership was the key word. To be competitive was not enough."

The issue was who would build that leadership. The Department of Defense (DOD) was ready and willing. But US scientists, especially, wanted a civilian agency free of the entanglements of military secrecy.

On Jan. 4, 1958, the American Rocket Society and the Rocket and Satellite Research Panel, an unofficial organization of scientists, published a paper calling for a civilian National Space Establishment. The two groups had been urging this for several months. On March 5, a presidential commission of governmental organization, the Bureau of the Budget, and the new office of presidential science adviser sent Mr. Eisenhower a joint memo recommending a civilian agency built around the old National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. This resonated with Eisenhower's own desire for civilian control.

One of the Army's greatest generals, Eisenhower nevertheless was deeply suspicious of what he called the military-industrial complex. He was determined it would not co-opt the nascent space program. Accordingly, on April 2, Eisenhower sent Congress a message requesting an agency along the lines of the memo. His message stressed that "a civilian setting for the administration of the space function would emphasize the concern of our nation that outer space be devoted to peaceful and scientific purposes."

NASA OPENS FOR BUSINESS

The proposal became law July 29, NASA opened for business Oct. 1. Within a week, it had launched Project Mercury—the start of the US manned space program. Then it settled down to what would prove to be an enduring squabble—deciding what to do in space.

NASA was born with built-in tensions.

If it is to aid national defense and yet be civilian and open, how does it divide up the work with the DOD? And what of the issue of secrecy? Some of the information NASA would disseminate so freely under its mandate would always be considered "sensitive" by the military.

In the early days of weather satellites, some military people worried that the pictures might give too much away. There is ongoing concern about how detailed earth resource photos should be. Geodetic satellites—used for precise measurements of Earth's shape and of distances on Earth—are especially controversial. Newell notes: "To the scientists the precise location of different points on the earth's surface relative to each other was vital for checking newly emerging theories about the movement of the earth's crust. But to the military those data would determined the position of potential military targets. . . . The conflict was fundamental."

Such conflict remains fundamental. It will never be fully resolved. NASA has had to deal with it on a case-by-case, subject-by-subject basis, with policy evolving as needed. The issue has arisen again with use of the space shuttle.

Of larger concern is the issue of military use of space itself. The US ratified the United Nations space treaty in October 1967. Among other things, it prohibits military use of space except for reconnaissance and similarly passive purposes. President Johnson called it "a permanent disarmament agreement for outer space."

This sounds like an echo from the past. In 1899, four years before the Wright brothers invented the airplane, the Hague Peace Conference urged that no aircraft ever be used in combat. Reconnaissance and other passive uses would be allowed, but discharge projectiles or explosives from aircraft was prohibited. Within 15 years, World War I saw the introduction of aircraft used as fighters and bombers.

Now the US and the Soviet Union are developing killer satellites and dreaming of laser battle stations. The issue of military use of space is far from settled.

NASA also faced dissension within the US scientific community. Should the space program emphasize big, bold projects or proceed with smaller, more numerous efforts? There was continuing opposition to the Apollo moon program by those who claimed it drained funds from space science. Research, they said, was better carried out with unmanned probes. The same debate hangs over the shuttle today. Here again is an issue that will never be finally resolved.

But as the young agency struggled to get its act together, it made one crucial decision. Rocket designers were accustomed to initial failures with new vehicles. NASA management opted for initial success. This set the tone for the entire program.

Experienced experts said it couldn't be done. Even von Braun's rocket "stars" were outraged at what they considered an impossible task. But von Braun himself backed the concept.

NASA top management began insisting on "zero defects" in manufacture. They instituted detailed planning and supervision for every phase of a project. Newell explains: "NASA could not afford to regard failure as accceptable under any guise. Success had to be sought on the first try. . . ."

The policy paid off. Launch rocket performance went from very poor during NASA's first two years to better than 90 percent success a decade later. Von Braun's powerful Saturn moon rockets worked the first time. The probability of a space mission's success came to be considered very high. The Pioneer 11 space probe, for example, still functions even though it has left the solar system. And Voyager 2 is on its way to Uranus after making spectacular surveys of Jupiter and Saturn.

Having acquired a philosophy of success, NASA rose to President Kennedy's challenge to put a man on the moon by 1970. It developed the weather satellites, which send the cloud pictures seen on the nightly TV news. It pioneered communications satellite technology and the first earth resource survey satellites. Its planetary program was turning what had once been distant lights in the sky into places to be visited by robot spacecraft and known in intimate detail.

URGED TO "SWASHBUCKLE"

It was only natural, as the 1970s opened, for US space planners to dream larger dreams. NASA administrator Thomas O. Paine urged his people to "swashbuckle." He spoke of lunar bases and called a large space station "the next logical step." Von Braun, brought to NASA headquarters by Dr. Paine, pushed for a Mars landing by 1990. Vice-President Spiro T. Agnew, as chairman of President Nixon's Space Task Group, also championed manned planetary expeditions.

But it was not to be. In general, the Nixon administration wanted a more restrained and "balanced" space program. Development of the space shuttle was approved. But NASA was put on a "level" budget. After Skylab and the US-Soviet joint spaceflight in the early 1970s, the Apollo system, built at such great expense, was phased out. It was considered too costly to be adapted for further use. NASA had been put on hold.

The 1970s did bring major unmanned expeditions to the planets, including the landing of Viking spacecraft on Mars. But these fulfilled earlier plans. The decade ended with a sense of frustration on the part of planetary scientists.

Now one wonders if NASA may be ripe for a renaissance. The shuttle is operating. The Reagan administration is building a new planetary program—one that emphasizes simpler, less costly missions and spacecraft. And, as President Reagan himself has said, the shuttle has "raised our expectations once more. It started us dreaming again."

Soviet progress toward a permanently manned space station may be an added spur. Certainly NASA's current administrator, James M. Beggs, thinks it's time for a US space station. Saying he expects White House approval in six to 12 months, he recently told Congress, "If the United States does not take this step, we will lose our preeminence in space."

Presidential science adviser George A. Keyworth II says he thinks "the country would take a major thrust in space very seriously." Noting that a space station "is only an intermediate step in a more ambitious long-range goal of exploring the solar system," he asks space planners to "lay those ideas out."

Who knows? By the time NASA celebrates its 50th anniversary, we may consider moon bases and Mars outposts as mundane as weather satellites, manned spaceships, and other such old-fashioned things, which seemed so hopelessly romantic before NASA was born.●

WE'RE OLD, NOT SENILE, RONALD

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, Margaret Kuhn, of the Gray Panthers, recently wrote an article which appeared in the New York Times on the Reagan administration's approach to health care. I think that she makes a strong case that the administration's cuts in health care programs are unfair and harmful. Our older citizens simply cannot afford to pay more and more for hospitalization. I insert her article at this point in the RECORD and urge my colleagues to read it.

[From the New York Times, July 31, 1983]

WE'RE OLD, NOT SENILE, RONALD

(By Margaret E. Kuhn)

PHILADELPHIA.—There is a theory of health-cost containment in vogue in Washington and among certain members of the medical establishment that suggests that good old supply-and-demand principles can reduce not only what it costs to treat the elderly and the poor but also the whole cost to our society of health care.

The theory goes like this: If sick elderly and poor people are forced to pay a larger share of the costs of treatment, they will shop around for less expensive care and the marketplace of health providers will be so fearful of losing money that it will respond by finding new and less costly ways to attract "buyers."

This theory is worse than just utter nonsense—it is an insult to the intelligence of Americans and a cruel attempt to shift the burdens of runaway health costs onto the shoulders of our most vulnerable citizens: the old and the poor.

This punitive approach is one of many put forth in the urgent attempt to finance Medicare and Medicaid into the next century. In addition to cuts in both programs by the Reagan Administration, the latest proposal would require the elderly sick—regardless of means—to pick up part of the cost of the first 60 days of hospitilization. This may sound reasonable for those with adequate incomes, but it does not make sense for a person on Social Security with only $284.30 a month to live on when the average cost of a day in the hospital is $245.

Can anyone seriously believe that an elderly person who falls sick will be able to shop around for less costly health care? Where? Another community hospital? Another family doctor? Does the President really think that elderly sick people can do what others have failed to do—confront the obscenely high costs of medical care in this country?

The current plan does one thing and only one thing: It allows the Government to run out on its commitment to the health of older citizens—and it does nothing whatsoever to contain the greed of the health care industry. In effect, it says to the elderly that our Government is too cowardly and ineffectual to deal with this hot issue, so older people must bear the burden.

Here are the dimensions of that burden:

Hospital costs last year rose three times faster than the inflation rate, and there has been an alarming 450 percent increase in the hospital day rate since 1950. Further increases will occur with the closing of community hospitals and the emergency of large chains of hospitals operating for profit. And health care for the elderly costs four times what it does for other Americans. Social Security provides the total income for more than a third of our nation's population over 65. Medicare is the only health insurance that most of the 26 million older Americans have. Even with that, Medicare covers only about 45 percent of their total day-to-day medical expenses.

The Administration has proposed a "trade-off" with older citizens: in exchange for cost-sharing of the already bloated medical costs of the first 60 days of hospitalization, the Government proposes to pick up the total cost of care after that period. What they fail to point out is that most hospital stays averge about 11 days and that less than one percent of the hospitalized elderly would use the "catastrophic illness" coverage. I believe the Government should provide both kinds of coverage and could finance both if it would find the courage to address the real problem.

The Administration has said it wants to increase everyone's consciousness of health care costs—from patients to hospital administrators. It seems to me that the very last people in this country who need a lesson in cost awareness are the elderly, most of whom count pennies in the supermarket, deny themselves even the most modest pleasures and even avoid seeking proper medical care because they fear the costs.

Let the Administration direct its message to those who have the primary power to cut medical costs; hospital profiteers who abuse the Medicare system by adding phony charges and inflating legitimate costs, doctors who ignore "reasonable charge" levels and bill whatever they please, proprietary nursing homes that continue to charge unconscionable rates despite one of the most shameful records of abuse in the history of modern medicine, physician teams who refuse to accept Medicare assignment and order unnecessary tests, drugs, procedures and in-hospital stays.

And let the message be heard by politicians who mistakenly believe that once people reach age 65 they lose their right to decent, affordable health care and their ability to fight for it. Older Americans have contributed much to this society and will continue to contribute to the well-being of future generations. The issues of age challenge the whole society and are the levers for change.●

AVITAL SHCHARANSKY ON HELSINKI: WORDS ARE NOT ENOUGH, WE NEED PERFORMANCE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, after 3 years of detailed negotiations, the member states at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe are poised to sign a new agreement, building on the principles of the Helsinki accords. Having just returned from the Soviet Union, I know how deeply important the Helsinki Final Act is to the refusenik community. They look to the signatory states to enforce its noble provisions and not only for Soviet Jews but for the persecuted Christians and courageous dissidents like Sakharov and others.

But the Soviet Union has disregarded their promises at Helsinki, refusing application after application submitted by individuals seeking to leave in order to be free to practice their religion, to pursue their art, or simply to live their lives. Even truly hardship cases, where families and married couples have been separated, are languishing after years of efforts to obtain visas to emigrate.

One of the most tragic cases is that of Anatoly Shcharansky, imprisoned on the false charge of spying. Perhaps better than anyone, his courageous wife Avital knows the vast gulf between words and action. She warns us that too easy an acceptance of Soviet assurances at Madrid can be a source of danger. "If the U.S.S.R. sees that the West is willing to reach agreements without requiring actual and concrete concessions, the Soviets will feel still more free to suppress human rights. The result will be not to protect human rights but to destroy them."

Soviet sincerity at Madrid will be tested in the days to come, as the West waits to see improvements in emigration, a lessening of internal oppression, the end of government-directed anti-Semitism, and the release of political prisoners whose only crime has been to assert their inalienable freedom of thought. As our great Ambassador to Madrid, Max Kampelman warned in his closing address at the conference, the West "cannot lull our publics into believing that words alone are adequate to erase the pressing threats to the integrity of the Helsinki and Madrid principles".

Soviet actions in the area of human rights will unerringly affect Western perceptions of Soviet good faith across the spectrum of East-West relations. For it is actions, not words, that speak loudest about the nature of the Soviet regime. The following poignant article by Avital Shcharansky says it best:

[From the Washington Post, July 31, 1983]

HUMAN RIGHTS: WHAT'S THE USE OF TALKING?

"This September, the three-year-long Madrid Conference will conclude with a ceremony. Today the members of the unofficial Soviet group monitoring the Helsinki Agreement remain in prison."

In August of 1975, after the signing of the Helsinki Agreement on security and cooperation in Europe, I received an exuberant letter from my husband, Anatoly Shcharansky: "They have signed an international agreement," he wrote, "and it speaks exactly of us: of the reunification of families and of free emigration. Soon we will be together in Jerusalem." Not only Anatoly but all those around him were elated.

Anatoly and I had been kept apart for a year: at the time of President Nixon's visit, I had been granted an exit visa, and Anatoly's application had been denied. We were told that unless I made use of my visa I would never be granted another. And we were told that Anatoly would certainly receive his visa within six months. I left. A year of delay and disappointment followed. With the Helsinki Agreement we hoped that Anatoly and many others would be allowed to go to Israel.

The reality, however, was different. At the very time of the signing of the agreement, the KGB began a new attack against the Jewish emigration movement. They forbade demonstations. Those who dared demonstrate to express their wish to go to Israel were arrested and sent to Siberia for five years. Those who applied to emigrate lost their jobs and were accused of being "parasites." Students who applied to emigrate were expelled from their universities and drafted into the army. Their applications were then dismissed on the pretext that they had learned military secrets. Those who refused to serve in the army were imprisoned.

In response to these and other violations against human rights, a group of very courageous people, including my husband, sought to bring Soviet violations of the accord to the attention of the world. The KGB fought against this group as well.

In 1977 Anatoly was arrested and sentenced to 13 years imprisonment on the ridiculous charge that he was a spy for the CIA—a charge immediately denied by President Carter. The true reason for the arrest and the very harsh sentence was the desire to destroy the Jewish emigration movement.

In 1978, the 35 nations met again in Belgrade to review compliance with the Helsinki Agreement. Again the same contradiction occurred. While inside at the official sessions there were speeches about human rights, in the Soviet Union the KGB was arresting and imprisoning those trying to defend the rights ensured them by the agreement.

This September, the three-year-long Madrid Conference will conclude with a ceremony. Today the members of the unofficial Soviet group monitoring the Helsinki Agreement remain in prison. Emigration has almost completely ceased. The Soviet government has launched an intense campaign of anti-Semitic progaganda.

Will Madrid repeat the experience of Helsinki and Belgrade?

A process that improves the dialogue between East and West certainly serves the interests of peace. But signatures without actions are self-contradictory. The countries participating in the Madrid Conference have a grave responsibility to the dissidents and "refuseniks"—those refused emigration visas—who have put themselves in danger. These brave people have attempted to uphold the rights that every country present at Madrid has previously accepted and is now reaffirming—rights that have not yet come to be.

For those trapped in the Soviet Union, Madrid can be not only a disappointment but a source of danger. If the U.S.S.R. sees that the West is willing to reach agreements without requiring actual and concrete concessions, the Soviets will feel still more free to suppress human rights. The result will be not to protect human rights but to destroy them.

Moreover, can Russia's commitment to future agreements be trusted when it refuses to abide by its prior agreement at Helsinki? If the Soviet Union hopes to continue the Helsinki process and to move on to further accords, it should offer concrete action demonstrating its good intentions.

In spite of the Soviet law granting visits to prisoners every six months, Anatoly had been denied visits for a year and a half. After months of writing letters, he learned that none of them had been sent. He began a hunger strike that lasted three and a half months. Finally, several weeks ago, on July 5, his mother was allowed to speak to him through a glass partition. He told her:

"Everything that has been done to me for the past six years has been illegal. Remember that at my trial it was announced that I had nothing to say to judges who in two hours' time would read a sentence that had been prepared well in advance, I will not say one word but every day that I am in prison is a continuation of the illegal situation that began with my trial. I am an innocent victim and this is well known to everyone, especially to those who framed me."

I add my own hopes that the United States, a nation founded on the principle of individual liberties, will be true to those who are fighting for these very principles.●

INTERN PETITION ON CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of the House a petition being circulated and supported by a group of congressional and governmental interns. The statement expresses the alarm felt by these interns at the increasing U.S. military involvement in Central America. The petition is a strong and cogent call urging the United States to respect the sovereignty of Nicaragua, to make a serious commitment to human rights in Central America, and to seek a peaceful resolution to the deeply rooted problems plaguing the region.

I strongly commend these interns for their actions. Interns play a vital role in the workings of our Government. They also have a unique opportunity to witness the operations of government on a firsthand basis. By making a forceful and positive statement designed to stop U.S. support of political violence in Central America, this group of young people serves as an example of the democratic spirit which we should all heed.

Mr. Speaker, the signers of this petition respectfully request an opportunity to meet with President Reagan to directly share with him their views on his policies in Central America. I urge the President to grant their request.●

NAMIBIA DOES MATTER TO THE WEST

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present for the RECORD an article which recently appeared in the August 1, 1983, Washington Times. The author, Max Huber, explains the importance of Namibia to the United States for its strategic position and vast natural resources.

There is a common misconception that because Namibia is presently under South African political control, unjust racial policies exist. This is untrue. In 1979, the Democratic Turnhill Alliance (DTA) passed legislation that provided equal pay for equal work regardless of race, opened trade union membership to all races, and called for free compulsory education. DTA is a popular based movement, seeking to form a government for all people of Namibia, and constitutes the first true multiracial party in modern African history.

The Soviet Union adeptly manipulates the media, bringing all South African initiatives, including those on Namibia, into disrepute. They seek political domination and destabilization of the region for strategic purposes. Ideally, the Soviets would deny the United States access to these vital raw materials, and attempt to bring the United States to its knees.

It is essential for the United States to have access to the wealth of valuable minerals in Namibia, in order to sustain our advanced standard of living. We must support the DTA and other movements that strive toward political democracy and are essentially Western oriented.

I commend the following article to the attention of my colleagues:

NAMIBIA DOES MATTER TO THE WEST

(By Max Hugel)

Few Americans have visited Namibia, otherwise known as Southwest Africa. Having just returned from there, I have a new understanding of the strategic and economic necessity governing our relationships with that corner of the world. Namibia, like much of southern Africa, is a treasure of minerals essential to any modern industrial society.

We must have access to such resources in order to remain economically viable and to continue to enjoy our advanced standard of living. The Soviet Union has a vested interest, therefore, in denying such access to us. The South Africa government plays a major role in determining the shape of Namibia's future, and this colors the glass through which Western eyes view this area.

The residue of guilt left over from more than a century of colonialism constitute a massive burden for the West. Apartheid compels Western press to scourge South Africa, and Western public opinion on

South Africa is largely negative because of this barrage of coverage.

This in turn plays into the hands of the Soviet Union, which adeptly manipulates the media, playing on the West's conscience and guilt. This brings all South African initiatives, including those on Namibia, into disrepute. Combined with support of "wars of national liberation," this effort constitutes a significant threat to non-communist control of this part of the world.

The Soviet bloc, the Organization of African Unity, and the United Nations all support the Namibian version of a Third World revolutionary movement—South West Africa People's Organization. SWAPO seeks to deny legitimacy to any other attempts to create a free government in Namibia, particularly any effort commanding South Africa support.

SWAPO, like so many other similar Third World movements, is Marxist-oriented and armed by the Soviets.

Whenever anyone questions SWAPO or attempts to assist the Demoractic Turnhalle Alliance (DTA), they are assailed in the world press as racists and fascists. Regrettably, too few Western journalists see SWAPO for what it really is, a Marxist-led terrorist organization. Too few see DTA as a multiracial, popular-based movement, seeking to form a government to represent all the people of Namibia.

The United Nations, ever eager to harm the West and aid the Soviets and their Third World allies, has recognized SWAPO as Namibia's de facto government. It wishes to supervise any election. Sadly, supporters of Western government and Western-style democracy are willing to go along with this.

There are other misconceptions about Namibia. Because SWAPO stems from the Ovambo tribe, representing about half the population, SWAPO wants observers to believe they are the majority political party. This is not true, and would be definitively proven in any free and fair election.

Another misconception holds that because Namibia is presently under South African political control, South African racial policies govern there. This is also untrue. In 1979, the elected national assembly abolished racial discrimination. Legislation exists providing equal pay for equal work, irrespective of race. Trade union membership is open to all, as are all residential areas. Education is free and compulsory for all children between the ages of 6 and 16. DTA presided over these reforms, and constitutes the first true multiracial party in modern African history.

DTA is confident it can win a fair and free election now. But it is leery of the United Nations playing a supervisory role in such an election, legitimately fearful that U.N. forces will allow SWAPO abuses. Intimidation torture and murder are its chosen methods. We must understand this clearly in order to play a role that will guarantee a result favorable to the West.

Recently, Secretary of State Shultz met with the head of SWAPO. He should extend the same courtesy to DTA Chairman Dirk Mudge.

It is vital that Americans not shrug off Namibia. The Soviet effort to destabilize the area of Africa has already created economic and social chaos. Several Marxist regimes in that area preside over economic catastrophe, and are casting covetous eyes in the direction of America. They want our financial aid, aid which they know will not be forthcoming from the Soviet Union.

The Soviets seek political domination and destabilization of that area, with us paying the bill. Then they will exercise their political leverage to deny us access to the raw materials while maximizing their strategic, geographical and military advantages.

To do otherwise is to contribute to our own downfall.●

ROTC: EMPHASIS ON EXCELLENCE

HON. HERBERT H. BATEMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the attention of my colleagues to the following speech delivered at Fort Riley, Kans., by Gen. William R. Richardson, the commander of the Army's Training and Doctrine Command at Fort Monroe, Va.

General Richardson's message to the 3d ROTC Avanced Camp is simple, straightforward and enduring: Excellence is a rare commodity in today's world, and the ROTC cadets are the product of this new emphasis. I would urge my colleagues to read this uplifting and inspirational speech, which has implications for all Americans.

ADDRESS BY GEN. WILLIAM R. RICHARDSON

Secretary and Mrs. Marsh, BG Watson, members of the Army Advisory Panel, distinguished institutional representatives, distinguished guests, ROTC cadets, families and friends.

It is also my pleasure and privilege on behalf of BG Watson, the 3d ROTC region commander, to welcome you to Fort Riley, to the ROTC Advanced Camp, and to this ceremony.

It is a great pleasure for me to return to Fort Riley, Camp Forsyth, and this parade field. I served here with the 1st Infantry Division in 1957-59 and with the 9th Infantry Division in 1966. I have some fond memories of soldiering here at Fort Riley.

This ROTC Advanced Camp—which is one of three—brings together over 3,000 men and women from 107 colleges and universities representing 16 States. They're out there training hard for everyone to see. What does not show so readily perhaps is the time and dedication involved in making it possible.

Advanced Camp begins on campus, of course. The professors of military science and their staffs devote a great deal of effort to preparing these young people to attend. The cadets have made their sacrifices, too. All of them know the physical and mental demands which will be made upon them. They've been in training on campus for the days they are now spending here.

The soldiers of the "Big Red One"—the 1st Infantry Division—have been an important part of this camp to contribute their absolutely indispensable assistance in making this all happen. Members of the Reserve components have been called in to help. The list of players is almost endless. We thank them for their help.

But it is the cadets in front of us this afternoon in battle dress uniform and Army greens who are the stars of this production. You have shown through your performance, your physical fitness, and your attitude that you are up to the demands being placed upon you, which is to learn how to lead the men and women of the Army in peace or war. The professional competence you display here at summer camp weighs heavily in our assessment of your potential. But it also tells you yourself how good you are—what your strengths and weaknesses are. And so I urge you to use this valuable 6-week experience to prepare you for your day of commissioning. From what I saw today, you will do exceedingly well as leaders in our Army.

We have before us a group of young men and women about to be commissioned into the U.S. Army. They represent the reason for this outpouring of manpower, time, energies, and dedication on the part of many players.

I hope that all of you are as proud of them as I am, and I know that you must be. For the educators in the audience, they are your changes. But better yet, I would say that they are our charges. We share a joint mission in educating and training them to be both citizens and military officers.

There is nothing incompatible in pairing education for citizenship with military training. This uniquely American concept has served us well for the past 60 years. Men and women have come from the campus to serve in the Regular Army or as members of the Reserve components. They have always performed far beyond our high expectations. I see no sign that this will ever change, and we should be grateful this is the case. We could not survive without this reservoir of educated leadership. To you institutional representatives, I want to express our appreciation for the outstanding work your institutions have done and will continue to do in preparing these and other young men and women for their roles in life.

Secretary Marsh has proclaimed 1983 as the year of excellence. He sees this as a time to set realistic goals for individual improvement and then working toward achieving these goals. It is up to us in the Army to make our adequate soldiers good, our good soldiers better, and our better soldiers the best in the world. We want the best we can get from all our people. These officers will be part of that exciting prospect.

In the Army's Training and Doctrine Command, we say that, "Excellence starts here" because we are responsible for the initial training of all the officers and enlisted personnel entering the Army and our schools and training centers must set the highest of standards. With respect to the 75 percent of our officers from ROTC, you educators have made your contribution to the process of excellence by making the maximum use of the best faculty you can assemble to expose these young people to ideas and to the accumulated knowledge of their disciplines. At the same time, we have been working to tell them about the Army—including this advanced camp—in preparing them as future officers. Their exposure to excellence is well underway.

At their officer basic courses, we will train them to serve in specific branches. After that, they will begin combining what they learned on campus and what they have learned during their total exposure to the army to become leaders.

To you who will receive your commissions today, I welcome you to the officer corps of the U.S. Army. You add your names to the long list of graduates of ROTC who have served with distinction whenever and wherever they were called upon. When you agree to the provisions stated in your oath of office, you make a commitment to a profes-

sion and to a way of life. It is not an oath to be taken lightly, as those who have sworn to it before will tell you. It is an oath of office remarkable in its brevity but enormous in its consequences. Upon its execution you will join the profession of arms and it is a profession—make no mistake about that. We are a unique society of individuals with our own professional ethic by which we govern our lives. It is the very foundation which gives us the confidence to meet any test offered us. Our ethic has four fundamental qualities.

First, we believe in commitment. That begins with your oath. Your first leadership assignment is another commitment, both to those you lead and those who lead you and your unit. These commitments never stop. As you gain in rank and experience, you will face commitment to bigger and more far-reaching issues. The commitments you must always remember are those to your Nation, your service, your leaders, and those you lead. You will, of course, be committed to excellence at all times. You must strive to improve whatever is in your power to improve. Leave everything with which you are connected better than when you found it.

Second, we believe in competence. Lincoln said "I will study and prepare myself and someday my chance will come." You must do the same. If you are not competent in a tactical and technical sense, you will not be qualified to lead. If you are not qualified or not fit to lead, you are a danger to your soldiers. You may expose them to danger needlessly, and they are a precious resource. Even worse, you will destroy their confidence in themselves—and in you.

Remember always that a bad leader with the best troops can be a clear and potential menace to them and to himself. On the other hand, a competent leader—as history has proven time and time again—can take untrained but willing troops and inspire them to do wonders by his example.

The decision point in our profession is the battlefield. We do not want it to be so, but it is our duty to spend our lives training for something we hope we never have to do—that is, to go to war. Soldiers are more aware than anyone of the hazards involved in war, but if we must fight, we must also have people who know what they are doing. There is simply no alternative to this.

Third, we believe in candor. To us, candor means that you have no time or use for lies. You can't abide double meanings. You want communications which are accurate, straightforward, and honest. Let your soldiers see you as honest in all your dealings. Expect the same from them. Let your word be your bond and expect the same from your soldiers. You will rarely find a soldier to whom you cannot safely extend this expression of your regard for him or her. Candor is based on a strong sense of personal honor—a sense of what is right and what is wrong. This is not as easy as it sounds. Find a role model whose honesty and trustworthiness you respect. You can gain more from understudying a proven leader than in any other way I know.

Finally, we believe in courage. We believe you can develop the physical courage to do your job of leadership under even the most terrifying conditions. If you are competent and confident in your ability and that of your command, you can meet and defeat fear. Physical courage is rooted in believing in your unit, your own excellence at leadership, and your devotion to your family, to your service, and to your country.

Moral courage is often another story. It takes as much courage to take and hold an unpopular stand—when it might be easier to blend in with the faceless majority—as it does to face a line of oncoming armor. But if you believe that you are right—after sober and considered judgment—hold your position. When this stand applies to the pursuit of personal or unit excellence, you owe your country nothing less. The officer corps must possess the highest sense of moral courage if it is to fulfill its purpose of leadership for the American soldier. This will not be easy, nor should it be.

And so, these four qualities symbolize the attributes and values of the American military professional. As officers, you men and women will face a difficult task which must be centered around these values, if we are to succeed in our pursuit of excellence.

The constancy provided the members of the officer corps by their belief in and adherence to the professional ethic I described has been the secret of our success for over 200 years. I know that none of you will ever dim the luster of our unique and storied profession. Your country and your Army expect nothing less from you.

You are a chosen few. A great many other men and women have chosen to drop out or failed to meet the challenges in the race for excellence along the way. You are the stayers—the ones who persevered. We expect you to demonstrate such perserverance many times in the years that lie ahead.

I want to personally congratulate each of you and I wish all of you Godspeed and the best of fortune for the future. Be all you can be. It is important to your school, to your family, to the Army, and to your country that you do so. We know that you will not fail us.●

STRATEGIC MINERALS

HON. MARK D. SILJANDER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, I am becoming alarmed at the Soviet-backed grab for the strategic minerals in Namibia by the SWAPO terrorists.

Namibia (South-West Africa) is a country generally unknown to Americans despite the important U.S. national defense interest involved there.

Operating from military bases in the southern part of Soviet-controlled Angola with the help of 30,000 Cuban soldiers, SWAPO armed with Soviet military equipment, is conducting a terrorist campaign across the border against the black civilian population of northern Namibia.

Namibia is the gateway to ultimate Soviet control of the strategic minerals in southern Africa. Chrome, vanadium, the platinum group and about 30 other minerals are vital to the U.S. national defense industrial base. Without access to these strategic minerals, U.S. electronic computer, aircraft and defense industries will be badly crippled.

Not only does Namibia have the larest uranium mine in the world, and vast resources of copper, diamonds, lead, tungsten, tin, zinc and oil, but its western coast deepwater ports can harbor Soviet nuclear submarines in a position to bisect the oil and mineral lifeline from the Persian Gulf to the United States and NATO countries of western Europe. More than 28,000 ships a year follow this sea route around the Cape of Good Hope.

If the Soviets through SWAPO can drag Namibia behind the iron curtain the United States loses another ally in the mineral resource war and the Soviet Union makes a huge gain in its campaign to deprive the United States of the strategic minerals in southern Africa.

As a part of a worldwide propaganda campaign for support of their mineral resource war, the Soviets are encouraging a disinformation war of words to persuade Americans to disinvest in business enterprises helping develop Namibia and southern Africa. The following letter from an official in Namibia conveys a message of importance to all of us.

GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA/
NAMIBIA,
Washington, D.C., July 19, 1983.

Hon. MARK D. SILJANDER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SILJANDER: There is at present a propaganda campaign demanding "disinvestment" in companies active in Namibia and South Africa. Disinvestment punishes American investors and the working people of South West Africa/Namibia without achieving any compensating benefits.

Namibia is a small country with a population of only about one million persons in an area twice the size of California. It is on the threshold of independence from its status as a Territory of the Republic of South Africa.

Namibia is a semi-arid country with 11 major population groups who speak 8 languages and 29 dialects. A large part of the population is engaged in subsistence farming, while others work in mining and processing industries.

By enactment of Public Law No. 3 on July 11, 1979. Namibia made racial discrimination punishable by fine and imprisonment. This statute was passed by Namibia'a predominately black National Assembly, and is bringing significant change.

It is morally and legally wrong to urge withdrawal of investment in American companies doing business in Namibia and southern Africa at a time when Namibians are struggling to improve their country. Economic sanctions such as "disinvestment" hinder our progress toward a more developed and productive economy.

When U.S. companies are unable to invest in South West Africa there is a direct injury to the people because of lost job opportunities. As in other Third World countries, jobs and development depend upon foreign investment.

Mr. Vernon Jordan, former President of the National Urban League, has said ". . . there are many in this country who would encourage and/or legally prohibit U.S. firms from doing business in South Africa and it is easy for them to take this stand because they do not have to witness the devastating

unemployment that will accompany massive disinvestment . . .".

Recently, U.S. Under Secretary of State Eagleburger re-stated U.S. Government opposition to "disinvestment": "The record of U.S. corporate citizenship in South Africa, though not perfect, is clear and impressive. Our firms have been pace-setters for change. Those in the U.S. and other Western nations who would have our firms disinvest not only ignore this record of achievement but propose measures that rest on no discernible philosophic or policy premise. Disinvestment by U.S. firms would undo an avenue of positive effort. Proponents of corporate disinvestment—and of stockholder or pension manager sales of stock of firms operating in South Africa—would have Americans wash their hands of any association with that country. This apparent quest for symbolic dissociation is, in reality, a formula guaranteed to assure America's irrelevance to South Africa's future."

If U.S. capital is "disinvested" in the region there will be widespread unemployment in Namibia and American taxpayers may be called upon to provide millions of dollars of foreign economic aid, as they now provide to many food-deficient former colonial areas of Africa. The Soviet-backed SWAPO terrorist campaign to seize control of Namibia will be the only winner if the "disinvestment" propaganda offensive in the U.S. succeeds. We hope you can bring this problem to the attention of your colleagues in Congress.

Very truly yours,

F. JARIRETUNDU KOZONGUIZI,
Director of Government Liaison.●

A CRISIS AMONG THE POOR IN AMERICA: HUNGER

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 40, and majority support of a similar measure in the Senate, are symbols of our renewed commitment to help the hungry of America. I would like to commend my colleagues for overwhelmingly approving the concurrent resolution, which opposes further budget cuts in Federal nutrition programs for fiscal year 1983 and fiscal year 1984. Because of my deep concern about poverty, I have worked diligently in my years as a Congressman toward the elimination of hunger, in both the United States and around the world.

Prior to the reductions in funding for these nutrition programs in the 97th Congress, it appeared as though we were beginning to control hunger within the United States. Through tremendous national efforts to insure that the poor did not go hungry, we had ceased expansion of the diseases associated with malnutrition, and began to eliminate them completely. As instances of malnutrition decreased, the overall health of our Nation increased.

However, the lingering recession in the United States has placed many American workers in unemployment lines. The Census Bureau recently announced that the number of Americans currently living below the official poverty line has risen to 15 percent of the entire population, or 34.4 million people. In more relevant terms, more than 1 out of 7 Americans cannot provide enough for basic subsistence living. This is the highest national poverty rate since 1965, when President Johnson declared an all-out war on poverty. In California, the severity of this problem is great; unemployment in June stood at 10.3 percent.

In response to this growing concern over hunger in America, volunteer and private relief organizations have increased in number, expanding their efforts to alleviate hunger. In my congressional district, there has been an upsurge in the organizations combating the problem in the local area. Their efforts include gleaning programs, senior meals programs, and food distribution programs. However, these groups have been encountering demand increases which are 200 to 300 percent higher than last year. With their limited resources, they have had extreme difficulties in providing for these growing needs.

As a response to this growing increase, I have taken several actions to fulfill this need. I have cosponsored legislation to create a Select Committee on Hunger in the House of Representatives, the recently passed resolution to continue current hunger and nutrition programs, and the Emergency Food Assistance and Commodity Distribution Act. I support the surplus commodities distribution program and recently sent a letter to Agriculture Secretary Block requesting clarification on aspects of the program which have been causing difficulties in California.

On June 4, I held a town meeting at Riverside City College to bring agriculture, hunger, and nutrition professional together to discuss this issue. The purpose of this gathering was to establish a network of agencies and organizations to coordinate services in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, and to keep the local officials and myself informed on community nutrition and health needs. We also began an education and information network for the purpose of educating these residents about the nutrition and health services in both counties. I was excited by the positive response at the meeting, and am now planning follow-up sessions to measure the effectiveness of these networks.

One food bank which distributes to agencies in the two-county area, the Survivor Food Bank, distributes food to approximately 35,000 families per month. During the last 12 months, the demand for their services has doubled. Daryl Brock of the Survivor Food Bank states that—

> The demand is there, it is increasing, and if things do not improve, we will probably see a doubling between now and this time in 1984.

As a palliative to this rise in demand, the Reagan administration began the cheese distribution program in late 1981. Although this program was actually decreasing the Government's economic burden of possessing enormous stockpiles of foodstuffs, the program ran into immediate difficulties. Local distributors experienced difficulty in dispersing cheese, butter, and other perishable commodities because they did not have adequate storage facilities. Furthermore, the large shipments required many workers to unload and distribute the foods. Other complications included limited funds, inaccurate notification on the arrival of shipments, and inconsistent shipments. However, the greatest problem was that local groups could not keep up with the demand for cheese.

In order to improve the program, Congress passed the emergency food assistance program in the emergency jobs bill earlier this year. This legislation was intended to provide more Federal commodities for distribution, while providing assistance to distribution agencies, to alleviate the administrative and logistical burdens they were facing. The jobs bill provided for the commodities to be allocated on the basis of the number of unemployed, and the number of families living below the poverty level. Previously, the cheese distribution was based solely on request.

In late May, the period which Public Law 98-8 was to be implemented, the USDA announced a reduction in cheese distribution of almost 50 percent, in response to indications that the program was reducing commercial sales of cheese.

For California, this reduction meant a drastic cut in the commodities it was to receive this summer. The distribution agency for the State did not have enough prior notification to adjust for this reduction. As a result, it continued to request the previous quantities of cheese and other foodstuffs for the first few months, as it was too late to cancel the orders of local agencies. California is currently experiencing a severe reduction in shipments of food, due to the fact that overall allocation from the jobs bill has been depleted. While California had received between 3 and 5 million pounds of cheese per month during the spring, its portion for July and August were between 0.75 and 1.6 million pounds. Recently, I testified at a hearing before the House Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations, and Nutrition, urging the USDA to increase its distribution program.

Congressional action to oppose further reductions in Federal nutrition programs has renewed our commitment to assist disadvantaged Americans. It has also acted as a catalyst for the Reagan administration to reassess its position. The President has now announced the appointment of a task force to study the problem of hunger in America. Furthermore, the administration announced yesterday that it would release more than 10 million pounds of cheese a month, as well as increased amounts of other surplus commodities. The Government will also make available an additional 2 million pounds of butter, 1 to 2 million pounds of nonfat dry milk, 2 million pounds of honey, and 3 million pounds of cornmeal per month.

I strongly believe that these steps have revived our commitment to assist the poor of the country. However, I believe that it is essential that our goals remain consistent. To assure the success of these programs, we should revive President Johnson's declaration of war on poverty in the United States. With such a commitment, we should not fail. In this great country with its high agricultural productivity, I cannot justify allowing the Nation's poor to go hungry.●

LUTHERAN CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICE AND REFUGEES

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, the problem of refugee resettlement is a serious one in many parts of the country. Thousands of refugees from all over the world continue to enter the United States in search of freedom and a better life. These refugees often have no jobs, no family in this country, and no knowledge of our language.

I would like to inform the Congress of the outstanding efforts of the Lutheran Children and Family Service in Philadelphia. The successes of this organization are detailed in the following article from the Bucks County Courier Times of April 21, 1983. The Lutheran Children and Family Service has eased the difficult transition which faces refugees by providing housing, transportation, and other assistance for refugees of all nationalities. The program has been so successful that all of the sponsored refugees in the Philadelphia area have adjusted smoothly to their new lives. However, the Lutheran Children and Family Service and other organizations like it throughout the country need support and sponsors for new refugees. I hope that the following article spurs such support:

SUCCESS FOR REFUGEE PROGRAM MEANS IT IS NO LONGER NEEDED

(By Denise Foley)

If it hadn't been for the eight Waziris, it would have been a pitiful turnout.

The Morrisville church which, for almost three years, had hosted pot luck suppers, square dancing and Christmas parties for Southeast Asian refugees was nearly empty this rainy Friday night.

Except for the Waziris, new refugees from Russian-occupied Afghanistan, there was no one to learn how to plant bok choy seeds or munch the bags and bags of Pepperidge Farm cookies at this last Friday night program sponsored by the Lutheran Children and Family Service.

So why was Jody Kerssenbrock grinning?

"The reason no one came is that they don't need us any more," said Ms. Kerssenbrock, assistant director of the agency's refugee sponsorship program.

The covered dish suppers and the kite-making projects and the folksinging evenings were a sugarcoated acculturation program for refugees from war and terror—Vietnamese, Cambodians and Laotians mainly, who were finding America a lonely sanctuary.

The monthly get-togethers—at the First Presbyterian Church—were an opportunity to meet with others who spoke their language and shared their experiences. It was a chance for their American sponsors to eat homemade spring rolls—and the Southeast Asians to learn to like hot dogs and baked beans and chili.

Most of the refugees had no jobs and no transportation. It was, for many, the only evening out every month.

"Now, they're all busy," said Ms. Kerssenbrock, as the Afghan children tore around the church basement in a raucous game of tag. "They have jobs, friends, cars. They don't need us anymore."

For those few who do, like the Waziris, the monthly programs will move to Kendall Park, N.J., where there are more new immigrants to serve. They will be sponsored by the Lutheran Social Services of Trenton.

"We worked ourselves out of a job," laughed Dorrie Sillman, director of refugee programs for Lutheran Children and Family Service in Philadelphia. "They're acculturated."

But, she said, sobering quickly, "what we need is another wave, another group of people to reach out to help."

Although the original group of refugees is settled nicely into American life, there are still more coming, like the Waziris and other from Poland, Hungary, Rumania and Cambodia.

"What we need are churches to help out," said Ms. Sillman, who lives in Northampton Township.

Church sponsors provide housing and help to the refugees, filling apartments with furniture, taking care of transportation, language training and translating bureaucracy for them.

"It's not legal responsibility, but a moral responsibility," she explained.

The newest immigrants are the Cambodians. "We had one group come in the winter with only thong sandals and pitiful little bags of clothing," said Ms. Sillman. "We had purchased wholesale ski jackets and we've been giving them out all year. They're cold, even in August."

Sponsorship is often a large task. The refugees have little or nothing when they arrive and are estranged from American society by language and cultural differences. That is why the empty church basement Friday night represented a major victory.

"They now have lives of their own," said Dorrie Sillman with a look of satisfaction. "We're out of a job."●

CITIZENS FOR SAFE DRIVERS LEGISLATIVE AWARD

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, the Citizens for Safe Drivers Against Drunk Drivers and Chronic Offenders recently presented our colleague, JIM OBERSTAR, of Minnesota, with its Citizens for Safe Drivers Legislative Award, commending him for his lead role in enactment of the national driver register legislation, Public Law 97-364.

Fran Nathanson, who with her husband Ken founded the Citizens for Safe Drivers, made the presentation.

I am pleased to insert her remarks into the RECORD at this point, and to recognize both the Nathansons and JIM for their deep and enduring commitment to keeping problem drivers off our roads and highways.

PRESENTATION OF CITIZENS FOR SAFE DRIVERS LEGISLATIVE AWARD TO CONGRESSMAN JAMES L. OBERSTAR AT THE INTERNATIONAL FORUM ON TRAFFIC RECORDS SYSTEMS

(Presentation made by Fran Nathanson, Cofounder, Citizens for Safe Drivers Against Drunk Drivers and Chronic Offenders, Washington, D.C.)

From 1966 to 1975, Ken and I knew Jim Oberstar as one of our good neighbors in Bethesda, Maryland . . . a suburb of Washington, D.C. But since 1975, we have learned what a caring person he is . . . concerned about the lives of all Americans. We also discoverd what an effective Congressman he is.

After our 14-year-old daughter Kamy was killed in a highway crash the day after Christmas 1975, we were told by federal traffic safety officials that she might still be alive if the National Driver Register was working as Congress had originally intended. What was needed almost from its inception was new federal legislation bringing it into the computer age from its current slow mail system. We organized the first national non-profit citizens group to focus on drunk drivers and other chronic offenders.

We asked for Jim's help and we got it. Luckily, he was on the right committee . . . the House Public Works and Transportation Committee.

Over the past 7 years we have worked closely with Jim. We have come to know him not only as a dedicated Congressman—skilled in effective legislative techniques—but also as a person of great integrity, determination, and modesty—unusual for a lawmaker. His constituents are indeed fortunate to have Jim Oberstar as their representative.

Six years ago this very month, Jim introduced his first National Driver Register bill. Despite unexpected roadblocks, Jim kept the legislation moving until it was passed unanimously last October.

Although his bill was originally passed in the House in 1978, it was shortcircuited in the Senate which requested a one-year study by NHTSA. Based on this study, which confirmed his judgment that there was "no further justification for delay", Jim reintroduced new NDR legislation early in 1981.

When the Administration in the wake of a budget crunch set out to kill the NDR and wiped out its budget, Jim succeeded in getting Congress to earmark funds continuing the NDR until Congress could consider his bill. NHTSA had to provide the funds to operate NDR that it had already asked Congress to eliminate.

We have been impressed with the many strategies Jim used to rescue the NDR and keep the legislation from being weakened.

From the start Jim recognized that the NDR was a key element in the solution of the drunk driving problem. The National Driver Register law is indeed landmark legislation. It will help not only Jim's own constituents but will help safeguard every American from potential tragedies on our highways.

Although Jim worked for 7 years to secure passage of this bill, the law does not bear his name officially. That bothered us. It never concerned Jim in the least. He wanted only to get this legislation passed. But in the minds of knowledgeable citizens and safety people everywhere Jim Oberstar is the NDR in Congress. Almost without exception this legislation is referred to as the Oberstar law.

Jim knows how we feel about what he did to save and improve the NDR, but we want everyone to know. That is why on behalf of our thousands of members nationwide we preent this plaque. It reads:

"Citizens for Safe Drivers Legislative Award to Congressman James L. Oberstar for his lifesaving work in strengthening the national driver register to prevent highway deaths and maimings, July 18, 1983."

Jim, please accept this plaque as a symbol of our great admiration and deep affection.●

THE ABORTION QUESTION

HON. THOMAS J. TAUKE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Speaker, I submit for my colleagues' contemplation an article which appeared in yesterday's Washington Times. It offers a rarely voiced perspective on the abortion question.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Times, Aug. 3, 1983]

WOMEN FORM WEBA TO FIGHT ABORTIONS

(By Nancyjo Mann)

(Every year for the past 10 years, 1.5 million women have had an abortion. For many, according to Nancyjo Mann, founder and president of Women Exploited By Abortion (WEBA), having an abortion only began their problem. Mann was interviewed by Washington Times staff writer and columnist Tom Diaz.)

Q: Tell us about your experience with abortion and its consequences.

A: My experience goes back to 1974, the month of October, 30th day—the day that I killed my baby girl. It was a second trimester abortion. I was 5½ months pregnant.

I went to the doctor because family members had pressured me, had encouraged me. There was no "Nancy maybe you should reconsider," because it was not my idea in the first place, it was theirs.

My husband had walked out the door and deserted us. The responsibility of three children was just too much for him. I went to my mother and my brother and asked, "What am I going to do?" And my mother said "It's obvious, Nancy, no man's going to want you with three children, let alone the two you already have. You're probably not going to amount to a hill of beans and you're probably going to be on welfare the rest of your life."

And following those three positive, uplifting statements, she said "You're going to have to have an abortion." Then she called one of the leading ob/gyns in the Midwest, and he said, "Absolutely, no problem. Bring her on in."

Q: Did he know at the time how far you were along?

A: Absolutely. He does all kinds of second trimesters, no problem.

I went in and I asked, "What are you going to do to me?" All he did was look at my stomach and say, "I'm going to take a little fluid out, put a little fluid in, you'll have severe cramps and expel the fetus."

I said, "Is that all?" He said, "That's all."

It didn't sound too bad. But what that doctor described to me was not the truth.

I went to the hospital and 60 ccs of amniotic fluid were drawn out, and a saline solution injected. Immediately the needle went through the abdomen I hated Nancyjo, I hated myself. With every ounce of my being I wanted to scream out "Please, stop, don't do this to me." But I couldn't get it out.

Once they put in the saline there's no way to reverse it. And for the next hour and a half I felt my daughter thrash around violently while she was being choked, poisoned, burned and suffocated to death. I didn't know any of that was going to happen. And I remember talking to her and I remember telling her I didn't want to do this, I wished she could live. And yet she was dying and I remember her very last kick on her left side. She had no strength left.

I've tried to imagine us dying that kind of death, a pillow put over us, suffocating. In four minutes we'd pass out. We'd have that gift of passing out and then dying. But it took her an hour and a half just to die.

Then I was given an intravenous injection to help stimulate labor and I went into hard labor for 12 hours. And at 5:30 a.m. on the 31st of October I delivered my daughter whose name is now Charmaine Marie. She was 14 inches long. She weighed over a pound and a half. She had a head of hair and her eyes were opening.

I got to hold her because the nurses didn't make it to the room in time. I delivered my girl myself. They grabbed her out of my hands and threw her, threw her, into a bedpan. After they finished and took her away in the bedpan, they brought a lady in to finish her last hour of labor lying next to me. She had a healthy baby boy.

That was tough.

I liked Nancyjo, I liked me, prior to the abortion. But shame and remorse and guilt set in—I mean, when you get a hold of your own daughter and you see what you did. She was not a "fetus." She was not a "product of conception." She was not a "tissue adhering to the uterine wall." She was my daughter and I got to hold her, at only 5½ months, 22 weeks. So those are cheap, inhuman words to use around me.

I chose to be sterlized because I couldn't cope with the idea that I could possibly kill again. It was too devastating. It was not something you go around telling people, that you just killed your baby, no problem. I was ashamed, totally ashamed.

Q: But some people would say that although this experience obviously had a great impact on you, it is not characteristic of most other women who have abortions. Is your case unusual?

A: No, my case is not unusual at all. People want to say "Oh, but Nancy, you're the extreme." That's not true. In fact there are so many more of us than there are the other. The emotional hurt is so deep. You do not discuss your abortion, the suction machines and the needles and everything else, over a cup of tea and a cookie. Women just don't do this. The pain is just too deep and too great.

I'm sure there are women out there who are never fazed, never, by their abortion. But I would say that 98, 99 percent of them are fazed, whether it's for a small period of time or for the rest of their life, whether they suffer only a small degree or die from their abortions.

Q: How did WEBA—Women Exploited By Abortion—get started?

A: About one year ago I was talking to another recording artist who was pro-life. I asked what pro-life meant and he said he was anti-abortion. I said "Hank, I had an abortion in 1974. I was 5½ months pregnant. It hurt so bad for so long."

He just about drove the car off the road. And he said, "Nancy, you've got to tell the story." So, a year ago I went public, founded WEBA.

Q: How many members do you have?

A: I'm a 10-month-old corporation and in 10 months I've gone from being two people, my vice president and myself, in two states, Virginia and Iowa, to now having 34 states with approximately 10,000 women in my group.

Q: What are some of the effects of abortion on women?

A: I have women who cannot vacuum their carpets. They have to have the neighbor or their husbands do it while they're at the grocery store, because of the suction sound. You see, the suction machine (used in many abortions) makes that sucking sound—it's 29 times more powerful than the vacuum we use in our home. The majority of the women aren't put to sleep. It's done without being put to sleep. It's heartbreaking to me that they can't run a vacuum cleaner—that's a deep wound.

One psychological effect we see almost all the time is guilt. Others are suicidal impulses, a sense of loss, of unfulfillment. Mourning, regret and remorse. Withdrawal, loss of confidence in decision-making capabilities. They feel that maybe they've made a wrong decision, maybe they can't make another decision right in their life. Lowering of self esteem. Preoccupation with death. Hostilities, self-destructive behavior, anger and rage. You can lose your temper quickly. A despair, helplessness, desire to remember the death date which is really weird but you do that. You remember these dates very strongly. A preoccupation with the would-be due date or due month. My daughter was due in early March, so in early March it's there.

An intent interest in babies but a thwarted maternal instinct. Women really are interested in babies, but I have many mem-

bers who can't hold children. A hatred for anyone connected with abortion. Lack of desire to enter into a relationship with a partner, loss of interest in sex, an inability to forgive self, feeling of dehumanization, nightmares, seizures and tremors, frustrations, feelings of being exploited. And child abuse. We see a lot of child abuse.

I want you to understand that I do not come from any right to life organization. We are connected with no one. We remain neutral. But we are the ones they are all arguing about and discussing and debating. We are the voice of experience.

I told Congessman (Henry A.) Waxman, D-Cal., at a recent hearing, "Have you ever had your cervix dilated and the womb ripped open? Have you ever had tubes stuck inside of you and everything sucked out? Have you ever had needles stuck through your abdomen? Have you ever felt your baby thrash around and die? Have you ever had hard labor, delivered and held your baby? Because if you haven't, sir, you can't intelligently talk to me about this. We are the voice of experience. We've all had this done to us."

And that's a fact. So we hold our own ground, our own turf, our own territory.

Q: What is it that your organization does as a voice of experience?

A: We are a support group for those women who hurt—physically, emotionally, mentally and spiritually—from their abortions. We are there when the phone rings at 3 in the morning and someone is suicidal because maybe it was four years ago on that day and they still can't cope with it. We cry with them and talk with them. We are a support group. We also are a political group. I am classified as that, and I guess the strongest thing of what I intend to do—I intend to shut the abortion industry down. I intend to shut the abortion-on-demand industry down.

We also have rape victims and incest victims among our members—the other 3 percent (not abortion-on-demand). And every one of them is getting ready to go public, to speak very publicly—their full names, ages, everything. They're not ashamed. They know what happened to their lives. They became victims of an industry that is making lots of money, that was supposed to be a quick answer.

And now they're under psychiatric care, psychological care. Because of the abortion, not the rape and incest. They overcame the rape and the incest. Sure they needed help, but they overcame that. But they have had a very difficult time overcoming killing that innocent baby.

They heard of WEBA and they contacted us. And two of them were so brutally beaten they couldn't make it to the hospital in time. Pure rapes, I'm not talking about just a strong sexual aggressiveness. I'm talking about women who were brutally beaten, true rape victims.

Q: You talked about political activity. What's been your experience here in the Congress?

A: I testified two weeks ago before Rep. Waxman, Barbara Mikulski and a few other congressmen. It was a stacked hearing—14 to 1 doesn't sound very balanced to me. But I went in very open and honest with them, they sat very intently and very amazed at the story I had to tell about my organization, myself and my constituency, WEBA.

Barbara Mikulski said "I've never heard this side." I said, "No, Pandora's box got opened up 10 years ago and now you're just starting to see it." I predict that in five years we will see an epidemic of mental and nervous breakdowns among the women of this country. People are not going to know why and I'm going to be able to tell you why: because they've had an abortion that's why.

It's a quick solution. Abortion is not an ending of problems, it's the down payment for a whole new set of problems. That's what it is. It doesn't get rid of them.

Q: Have congressmen been exposed to your view, the voice of experience?

A: No, I hear time and time again, "I've never heard this side before." "Are there many more like you?" they ask. And my answer is this. Take the 15 million of us who have, by legal abortion-on-demand, killed our babies. I will give 2 million or 3 million to Planned Parenthood, NOW or whoever they want. I will give another 2 million or 3 million who have two or three abortions without open remorse.

And justification to oneself is important here, by the way, I don't know how many women I told to go have abortions. Justification. It's like, if you can have a few more, go do what you did and kind of justify it, it makes it better. It makes it not quite so bad.

That still leaves 9 million of us who've been hurt in one way, shape or form or the other—psychologically, physically, emotionally or spiritually.

Q: So you believe that there are—by conservative estimate—perhaps 10 million women who suffered as you did?

A: I believe by a very conservative estimate there's 8 million who have been hurt.

Q: Where can they write or call? Or what can they do if they need somebody, such as your organization?

A: They can call or they can write. The address is WEBA, 1553 24th St., Des Moines, Iowa 50311. Or they can reach me at 515-255-0552, my business phone. If they hurt, if they're at a certain state, I may have as state representative where a girl can be with them and talk with them. I get so many women who have written me to say, "Thank God, there is somebody that I can now finally pour the whole thing out to."

And I'm thankful that I am a Christian because I couldn't carry that load. If you could read my mail . . . It started off where I'd get two and three letters a day and now they're wrapping it in bundles to bring it to me. And I get mail from all over the world.

Q: Within 10 months this has happened?

A: In 10 months. There is such a need. No one thought 10 years ago of the aftermath. We're the aftermath.●

OUR IMPROVING ECONOMY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the last few years, our concerns have centered on the state of our economy, and its resultant effects on industry, sales, inflation, and employment. As a nation, we had reached the point where inflation was out of control, spiraling ever upward. Disposable income was almost nonexistent as a beleaguered people sought to survive.

However, in the last few years, through a recession that many saw as a trial by fire, we have emerged; not unscathed, but nonetheless alive and kicking. Some suggested that we needed to relearn the values of hard work and the dollar. Having taken for granted our prosperity in the last decades, many felt that we, as a people, had become much too soft and too complacent. The last decade was known as the "me" decade; the eighties, I feel, will utimately be known as the "us" decade. The years when we all realized how much we had to rely upon one another for even the most basic of human needs.

There is much to look forward to for the rest of the decade; recent economic indicators point to a great deal of light at the end of the tunnel. Inflation is at a 15-year low, with June's inflation at 2.6 percent. This is the smallest rise in a 1-year period since October 1967. Food prices have declined as well, and many other prices have either been lowered or remained stable.

The consumer is leading our economic recovery, with heavy spending that is running 2 percent above last year's inflation rate. Retail sales are up dramatically, and each month finds ever-increasing consecutive sales in many areas, especially in automobile sales.

Much of our economic recovery can be attributed to the personal income tax cut that was phased in over a 3-year period. The 25-percent tax cut, the last 10 percent of which was implemented just last month, has given everyone additional income with which we can decide to invest, spend or save. This has provided an additional $30 billion for the economy, to be used as each consumer sees fit.

Housing starts have traditionally been one of the primary indications of a strong economy. As each housing start typically generates seven new jobs in construction, this contributes significantly to the overall stability of our economic system. As homes are bought, not only are construction or remodeling jobs contracted out, but numerous appliances are purchased as well. Furniture and fabric sales follow, as each residential unit is completed. The housing starts we have enjoyed in recent months represent a 92-percent increase from last year, a momentous sign from the American taxpayer that our economic recovery is not only at hand, but is rebounding strongly.

The stock market is also experiencing a bullish surge; business confidence in the economy being at an extremely high level, and personal confidence in the direction America is headed also being on the upswing. Interest rates, having come down, must be kept down in order for this recovery to continue. At the same time we must bear in mind that all these factors will only breed a half-hearted sigh of relief unless our unemployment

rate drops. Over 1.7 million more people are now employed than in December 1982, with an unemployment rate of 10 percent. As of June's figures, this is a heartening consecutive 6-month drop in unemployment. Since unemployment is traditionally the lagging economic indicator, it was expected that this would remain higher than normal. We have however, been witness to its steady decline, which is good news indeed. However, we must continue to maintain our vigil, insuring that we do all in our power to see to it that this figure drops ever more increasingly.

Mr. Speaker, we are today in a much better situation than we have been in a long time. It is good to see people working, producing, spending, and making long-range plans again. Our economic recovery is a much needed shot in the arm for each and every one of us, and we are hopeful that the good news we have been hearing this year will get even better. We are well on the road to a new philosophy of understanding ourselves, our goals and needs, as well as our limits. In this recovery we have learned more about us as a nation, and such knowledge can only make us stronger. As this recovery continues, we must learn to value its effects and relish its gifts. Having altered our approach to the problem, we must not forget that it was our spending habits as a nation and as individuals that contributed to our ills. This recovery has taught us a new way of thinking and of living, and of the role we all must play if we are to survive as a nation.●

CENTRAL AMERICA AND PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S UNSPOKEN WORDS

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives had held a historic secret session to consider the serious situation that exists in Central America. The House has acted to terminate covert aid to parties in Nicaragua and has instead opted for an unworkable and ineffective plan of overt military assistance to countries in the region. This policy decision represents a historic break with the President over the conduct of foreign policy, which is traditionally governed by the notion that partisan politics should stop at the water's edge.

Mr. Speaker, this year we will observe the 20th anniversary of another historic event, the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy by an assassin's bullet in Dallas, Tex., on November 22, 1963. In a recent commentary, Bruce Herschensohn, a political analyst with KABC-TV News in Los Angeles, quoted from the text of President Kennedy's prepared remarks that he was en route to deliver at the time of his assassination. They speak directly to the elements of the defense of freedom in the 20th century. The speech reads in part:

In this Administration also it has been necessary at times to issue specific warnings—warnings that we could not stand by and watch the Communists conquer Laos by force, or intervene in the Congo, or swallow West Berlin, or maintain offensive missiles in Cuba. But while our goals were at least temporarily obtained in these and other instances, our successful defense of freedom was due not to the words we used, but to the strength we stood ready to use on behalf of the principles we stand ready to defend.

Mr. Speaker, as the debate on Central American policy moves forward, we would do well to remember the words of President Kennedy and rededicate ourselves to the principles he espoused. I insert the full text of the commentary at this point in the RECORD.

BRUCE HERSCHENSOHN COMMENTARY

In about 4 months, this Nation is going to observe the 20th anniversary of the assassination of President John Kennedy—20 years. I was going to wait until then, until November to do this, but current events make it more important to do it now. I want to quote some words of President Kennedy and it's very likely that you could say, "I don't remember that. He didn't say that," and you'd be right, because as you know, he was killed while his motorcade was enroute to the Dallas Trade Mart where he was going to deliver an address at a luncheon.

I have the text of that undelivered address, and I would like to read from it, because his words planned for November the 22d of 1963, are so relevant to today's events, and today's debates going on in the U.S. Congress. His words:

"As last month's operation big lift, which originated here in Texas, showed so clearly, this nation is prepared as never before to move substantial numbers of men in surprisingly little time to advanced positions anywhere in the world . . . we have achieved an increase of nearly 600 percent in our Special Forces—those forces that are prepared to work with our allies and friends against the guerrillas, Saboteurs, insurgents, and assassins, who threaten freedom." And he said, "It was not the Monroe Doctrine that kept all Europe away from this hemisphere—it was the strength of the British fleet and the width of the Atlantic Ocean. It was not General Marshall's speech at Harvard which kept Communism out of Western Europe—it was the strength and stability made possible by our military and economic assistance. In this administration also it has been necessary at times to issue specific warnings—warnings that we could not stand by and watch the Communists conquer Laos by force, or intervene in the Congo, or swallow West Berlin, or maintain offensive missiles in Cuba. But while our goals were at least temporarily obtained in these and other instances, our successful defense of freedom was due not to the words we used, but to the strength we stood ready to use on behalf of the principles we stand ready to defend."

He went on to say this, "The strategic nuclear power of the United States has been so greatly modernized and expanded in the last thousand days, by the rapid production and deployment of the most modern missile-systems, that any and all potential aggressors are clearly confronted now with the impossibility of strategic victory—and the certainty of total destruction—if by reckless attack they should ever force upon us the necessity of a strategic reply."

I'm going to do more from that text later, and from another text . . . one that he was going to give that evening in Austin. The early sixties under his leadership, was a period in which the United States enjoyed superiority of strength and world respect . . . a period in which I believe, we have forgotten what we did to achieve that strength and world respect.

The words he planned to deliver in 1963 can remind us of the course we have to take in 1983, if liberty is to be preserved in our lifetimes.●

CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, during the past few months, Members of Congress have spent countless hours debating the issue of U.S. involvement in Central America. Most recently, discussion has centered around the Boland-Zablocki amendment to the House Intelligence Authorization Act, an amendment designed to end covert assistance to individuals and groups opposing the Sandinista government in Nicaragua. After days of intense floor debate, recalling for many the discussions of the Vietnam years, the Boland-Zablocki amendment passed in the House of Representatives on July 28, by a vote of 228 to 195. As one of 18 Republicans who voted to approve this legislation, I would like to explain how I reached this conclusion.

When the House Foreign Affairs Committee, on which I serve, discussed the question of covert aid to individuals in Central America, I voted to support the administration. At that time I felt that the situation in Central America was increasingly unstable. Although we deplore the use of covert activities, stopping the flow of arms from Nicaragua to insurgents attempting to overthrow the Government in El Salvador necessitated extraordinary measures. Because the Nicaraguan Government would not respond to pleas that it discontinue its aid to rebels in El Salvador, the United States was forced to take action to counter the threat. The administration's policy, I was told, was designed solely for the purpose of interdicting arms.

Virtually no one either on the Foreign Affairs Committee or in the Congress doubted that the Sandinistas, with the Cubans behind them, were providing arms to rebels in El Salva-

dor, but we disagreed on the necessary steps to counter the serious problems this was causing. I opposed the central idea of the Boland-Zablocki amendment, replacing covert aid with overt aid, as impractical and unrealistic. I was skeptical about the cost and effectiveness of an overt aid program, especially when I heard of the "barrier fencing" idea, which was a proposal to erect a fence to cordon off miles of Central American terrain—at a cost of $227,000 per mile. I feared that a program of overt assistance would, over time, require an unpredictable increase in U.S. military personnel in the region. I wondered about unanticipated future consequences, including the possibility that overt U.S. assistance could trigger Nicaraguan military retaliation against its neighbors. I was also concerned about the reputation of the United States as a reliable ally willing to stand by its friends and its convictions, especially in its own hemisphere. Those who espoused overt assitance failed to satisfactorily address these issues, and my concern that overt aid was not an effective alternative to the present policy remained.

At the same time, I was mindful of the intransigence of the Government in Managua. When the Sandinistas came to power in 1979, the Carter administration provided them with considerable economic support hoping that the Sandinistas would abide by the promises made to the Organization of American States (OAS) for internal reforms and internal peaceful relations. This aid, intended to assist in Nicaragua's peaceful reconstruction, was discontinued when the Sandinistas ignored their formal pledges to the OAS and postponed elections, censored the media, denied their citizens basic rights, and embarked on a "revolution without frontiers" policy. When the Reagan administration came into office, it nevertheless resumed aid to Nicaragua in the hope that cooperative bilateral relations would result. Instead, the Sandinistas continued to rebuff every attempt by the United States or its neighbors in Central America to initiate discussions.

In addition to periodic informal attempts at beginning constructive talks, the United States and other nations made four formal proposals to the Nicaraguan Government. In the fall of 1981, the United States suggested a bilateral nonaggression pact, establishing conditions for the resumption of aid. The major concerns of the administration were the cessation of Sandinista aid to leftist guerrillas in El Salvador and an end to the Nicaraguan military buildup. This proposal was flatly rejected, as was the eight-point plan presented to the Sandinista government through the U.S. Ambassador in Managua the following spring. In October 1982, the United States and other states met in San Jose to develop a comprehensive peace proposal for Central America. Nicaragua refused to receive the proposal when contacted by its neighbor Costa Rica on behalf of the group. Finally, at the start of this year, Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela, and Panama—the Contadora group—met to propose an effort at mediation. One proposal, supported by the Governments of Honduras and El Salvador, suggested that the five Central American countries meet to resolve the conflict in the presence of the Contadora group, absent the United States. Nicaragua rejected this regional overture, saying it would only meet bilaterally with the United States and with Honduras.

In recent weeks, for the first time since they came to power, the ruling Nicaraguan regime has expresed a willingness to cooperate with other nations in working toward a regional solution. Whether this new flexibility is the result of U.S. activities in the area or the work of the Contadora group, which has made a significant contribution, I expected the administration to take advantage of the opportunity and press the Sandinistas to make good on their word. Instead, the administration chose this time to proceed with military maneuvers with Honduras off the Pacific and Caribbean coasts of Nicaragua. As if two aircraft carriers where not enough to show U.S. strength, the Pentagon announced that some 3,000 to 4,000 combat troops would be sent to the region for at least 6 months.

Preparation for these exercises began shortly after the "secret" session of Congress on Nicaragua during which Members of Congress learned nothing new, certainly nothing about these plans and their imminence. Although the President claimed in his press conference that these were ordinary military exercises, my concern deepened because of an inability to ascertain the real role of the United States in Central America, despite frequent CIA briefings and discussions with White House officials. The military exercises seemed counterproductive, increasing tensions in the area at a time when there appeared to be some movement toward negotiations with the Sandinistas on a multilateral basis. Administration policy seemed to have shifted away from the original intent of permitting limited covert aid for the sole purpose of arms interdiction to the broader aim of pressuring a foreign government to conform to standards the United States found acceptable. I could not support that policy. Even the House Intelligence Committee, which had originally supported the administration's activities, became alarmed as the number of individuals and groups receiving U.S. assistance increased.

In the absence of a compromise that both the administration and the Democratic leadership could accept, the question I had to answer was whether I would protest the administration's current activities in Central America. The choice was either to vote in favor of allowing the continuation of unrestricted covert activities, or in support of a cutoff of covert aid. Thus, I chose to vote for the Boland-Zablocki amendment to prohibit U.S. support for military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua. This legislation proposed the cutoff of the now-public covert aid on a secret date before the end of fiscal year 1983. Covert aid would be replaced by $80 million in overt grant assistance to Central American governments to help them halt the flow of arms through their territories from Nicaragua and Cuba to individuals or groups attempting to overthrow the government of any country in the region. The support this legislation received in the House should serve notice to the Reagan administration that Congress is concerned about what U.S. policy objectives are in Central America, and is prepared to take necessary actions to stop excessive or improper activities.

The Reagan administration has made some recent efforts to devise a nonmilitary solution to the problems of Central America, including the appointment of Ambassador Stone and the bipartisan commission headed by Dr. Kissinger. I urge the administration to purse a responsible course that will lead to the cessation of violence and the development of a stable peace in Central America without an increase in U.S. military involvement.●

REMEMBERING THE PERSECUTED

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 5, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to remind my colleagues about the thousands of Jews who are being persecuted in the Soviet Union. Although this topic has been brought before the House on numerous occasions, this week it seems particularly timely. For amid the hustle and bustle of prerecess work, it is easy to forget to appreciate the gift of freedom, recognize those who are deprived of its blessing. This truth became even more evident when, while anticipating my own trip home, it struck me what a privilege it is to freely congregate with those we love.

Right now in the Soviet Union there are tens of thousands of people who are separated from their families—held captive in a bleak, hopeless society where terror and persecution are

synonymous with life itself. Since the Andropov administration took over, it has augmented the ever-present anti-Semitic propaganda, increased the attacks on those who study Hebrew and Jewish culture, intensified the assault on Judaism, and severely restricted all Jewish emigration.

Perhaps the most perverse of all the violations of human rights is the attempt to rewrite the entire history of World War II to depict the Jews as cooperating with the Nazis and as responsible for anti-Semitism. Yuri A. Kolesnikov, a member of the newly formed Anti-Zionist Committee, said, "In those days they (the Zionists) not only failed to defend their coreligionists, but betrayed them, wholly in league with the Gestapo and the SS." Kolesnikov is one of those who is propagating the story that Israel executed Adolf Eichmann "to make sure he would not be seized by another nation and make public the sacred secrets of cooperation between Zionism and Nazism." Col. Gen. David A. Dragunsky, chairman of the committee, proclaimed that "the past year has made perfectly clear that Zionism is increasingly modeled on the ideas and methods of Hitler." These blatant lies are being spread throughout the Soviet Union, and in a 1984 fashion, are warping the minds of those too young to know the truth about the bloody persecution of the Jewish people during the war. These young Soviets, whose perspective of truth has been covertly distorted, are those with whom we will have to negotiate in the future. The relationship between the lies of the Anti-Zionist Committee and the future of the arms race is clear.

Lies are also being formed by the Soviet officials in order to stop the emigration of the Jews. Samuil L. Zivs, the Anti-Zionist Committee's first deputy chairman, said, "The vast majority of those who want to leave have received permission." He also said that "family reunification has essentially been completed." These are the reasons given for the drastic decline in emigration since Andropov took over. The emigration figures are dismal: 51,300 Jews were able to emigrate in 1979, and only 2,700 in 1982. Less than 600 Jews were allowed to emigrate during the first 5 months of this year. Of the 750,000 invitations sent to Soviet Jews since 1970, 260,000 individuals have been allowed to emigrate. Therefore, nearly 500,000 Jews are still being held behind the iron gates of repression, either because they have been refused permission to emigrate, are afraid to apply, or are unable to apply because of the intricate web of bureaucratic obstacles.

One of the main obstacles which Soviets use to hinder emigration is the blockage of mail into Russia. The House Subcommittee on Investigations has "accumulated over 500 exhibits which indicate a widespread and calculated program by postal authorities in Russia and Soviet bloc countries to interfere with U.S. mail to Soviet residents." The restricted letters contain invitations from relatives in the United States, Israel, and elsewhere which are needed in the first step of emigration. The National Conference on Soviet Jewry says that by late 1979, at least 300,000 Jews had asked relatives abroad to send invitations to emigrate. No one knows how many of these people received their invitations, or were able to leave.

Although the situation for the Jews in the Soviet Union is not one which we in the 98th Congress can hope to rectify with ease or in the near future, we must not give up trying. Because their plight is seemingly ever worsening, it would be easy to become immune to their constant cries for help. We must continue to write letters to the Soviet officials on their behalf, because we who are free from persecution are their only source of hope and encouragement. When we go home next week and are reunited with our families and friends, let us thank God that we are free to be with the ones we love, and let us remember those who are still held beneath the shroud of darkness, hatred, and persecution.●

REIMBURSEMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' RELOCATION EXPENSES

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today, I am reintroducing legislation which would correct some of the inequities which currently exist when Federal employees are transferred from one geographic area to another to meet the needs of their Government agencies. I believe an unfair burden is placed on Federal employees who are relocated in their Government service jobs.

As a former Federal employee, I am sensitive to the special problems of our civil servants. But I also want to point out that that experience has given me a broader understanding of where productivity can take place. For example, I believe that the legislation I am introducing today, patterned after private sector moving practices, will force a reexamination of what moves are truly a necessary expense. When the Government is required to meet its responsibility in this area, I predict the ultimate result will be a more accountable response to the American taxpayer who provides the funds for these decisions.

My interest in this legislation arose originally from a letter I received last year from a constituent faced with exorbitant moving expenses, whose costs went largely unreimbursed and yet whose option to move was mandated by the Government agency he served.

This is not an uncommon occurrence. For example, the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Administration, Secret Service, IRS, Bureau of Customs, and many of the Department of Defense agencies must move their best middle and higher grade employees in order to staff their field offices with the best possible managers and executives. When reassignments are made to fill management needs, though, these agencies have found that many of these vital employees have chosen to leave Government service rather than accept moves they cannot afford.

Government, these employees, and the American taxpayer are losers in this situation. We cannot afford to lose the best managers, executives, and employees in our law enforcement and DOD agencies at a time when it is crucial that we have continuity and stability in Government to improve productivity and efficiency.

To rectify this longstanding problem, I am introducing this bill which I believe will serve two purposes. First, it can help to alleviate the hardship faced by these employees and their families. Second, it should provide the necessary disincentive to agencies in transferring these personnel and thereby eliminate wasteful and unnecessary Government spending.

I would point out that this legislation would carry no increased cost for the Government. A recent survey of agency heads conducted by the General Services Administration indicated that every Federal agency head except two would voluntarily absorb the increased cost resulting from employee transfer within their agency's operating expenses appropriations. Obviously the agency heads recognized the absolute necessity to correct the inequities which result from present law and are willing to end the practice of forcing Government employees to subsidize their employer on geographic reassignments.

I am firmly committed to this concept and feel that for too long Government employees who have been transferred at the Government's request have been forced to subsidize the Government through paying much of the moving costs, and paying taxes on the minimal reimbursement which they do currently receive. Information provided to me indicates that in many instances these employees are forced to pay anywhere from $500 to $10,000 or more out of their own pockets to make these moves. In a letter dated December 22, 1981, to Mr. Gerald Carmen, Administrator of the General Services

Administration, William H. Webster, the Director of the FBI, stated:

Results of the studies have shown that an employee and family relocating from one geographical area to another under today's economic conditions will spend several thousand dollars of their personal funds in connection with the transfer * * *. In discussions with my agents during the past year, the personal and financial problems facing them as a result of the Government's inadequate employee relocation allowances has repeatedly been presented as one of the areas of most concern to them.

In a letter to David Stockman, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, on May 22, 1981, Attorney General William French Smith noted in discussing moving cost reimbursements:

It is not unusual for such transferred employees to incur in excess of $10,000 of unreimbursed expenses. Although this is a government-wide problem, the hardships which result from these inadequate reimbursements have presented especially significant problems for the federal law enforcement agencies such as the FBI, the DEA, and the U.S. Secret Service, inasmuch as these agencies must transfer their agents more often than most agencies in order to meet their investigative responsibilities.

In addition, I have been informed by the Internal Revenue Service that while on the average, employees are reimbursed approximately $8,000 for moving cost expenses, an additional $8,000 is the average cost to an employee who is not reimbursed by the agency.

This bill would only apply to moves that were certified to be in the interest of the Government and would not apply to voluntary moves sought by the employee. It would also bring Government employees more in line with their private sector counterparts. Government employees would still be receiving far short of what many private sector companies do for their employees, such as subsizing interest rates in the purchase of new homes and purchasing old homes from the employees who are unable to sell their residences. While these are desirable benefits, in these times of austerity, I do not believe it is appropriate to expend Government funds for those purposes. But I do believe this legislation could provide fair and more equitable reimbursement policies.

By bringing Federal executives in line with private sector employees, and by forcing agencies to absorb the costs for transferring employees, I believe great cost savings can be achieved. This bill will benefit the affected Federal employees and the taxpayers and could successfully end the dilemma faced by many of our agencies as well. I urge support for this legislation.

SECTION ANALYSIS OF AMENDMENT

Purpose: This amendment provides for more adequate reimbursement for Federal employees who are relocated in their Government service jobs. By increasing the various reimbursement allowances for transferred or reassigned employees without authorizing additional agency appropriations for the fulfillment of this act, it is hoped that the number of Government moves will be reduced, that only essential relocations will be prescribed, and that agencies will be more directly accountable for the number of moves and subsequent costs involved with moving employees and disrupting families unnecessarily. By ordering moves only when essential, agencies should have the additional funds needed for these higher reimbursement rates. These provisions entail no costs to the Government.

This amendment makes reimbursement changes for relocated employees in the following areas: Expenses incurred in buying and selling a home; period of time for which an employee can be reimbursed for temporary quarters; weight limitations for household goods; and tax liabilities incurred because of moving cost reimbursements.

This act maintains the same percentage limitation for reimbursement of expenses in buying and selling a home, but abolishes the current limitations.

The period of time for which an employee can be reimbursed for temporary quarters is increased from 30 to 60 days and would allow an agency head to extend for another 60 days, this reimbursement period in hardship cases.

Previous weight limitations for household goods of 11,000 pounds is increased to 18,000 pounds maximum. The old limit is unrealistic and creates a hardship, requiring employees to sell their family furniture or pay excess charges for moving it.

The provisions of this amendment would reimburse employees for tax liabilities incurred because of moving cost reimbursements. This would bring Federal practice into line with the great majority of private sector companies.

Additionally, this amendment requires agencies to give the employee a reasonable period of advance notice of transfer.

H.R. 3852

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 5723(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(1)" after "travel expenses", by striking out "manpower shortage or" and inserting in lieu thereof "manpower shortage, (2)", and by inserting after "Senior Executive Service" the following: ", or of any person appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to a position the rate of pay for which is at or above the minimum rate of pay prescribed for GS-16".

(b) Sections 5724(a)(2) and 5726(b) of title 5, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "11,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "18,000".

(c) Section 5724 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) The regulations prescribed under this section shall provide that the reassignment or transfer of any employee, for permanent duty, from one official station or agency to another which is outside the employee's commuting area shall take effect only after the employee has been given a reasonable period of advance notice.".

(d) Section 5724a(a)(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence thereof, by striking out "30 days" and inserting in lieu thereof "60 days"; and

(2) by striking out the second and fourth sentences thereof and inserting after the first sentence the following: "The period of residence in temporary quarters may be extended for an additional 60 days if the head of the agency concerned or his designee determines that there are compelling reasons for the continued occupancy of temporary quarters.".

(e) Section 5724a(a)(4) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(A)" after "(4)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(B)(i) In connection with the sale of the residence at the old official station, reimbursement shall not exceed 10 percent of the sale price or $15,000, whichever is the lesser amount.

"(ii) In connection with the purchase of a residence at the new official station, reimbursement shall not exceed 5 percent of the purchase price or $7,500, whichever is the lesser amount.

"(iii)(I) Effective October 1 of each year, the respective maximum dollar amounts applicable under clauses (i) and (ii) shall be increased by the percent change, if any, in the Consumer Price Index published for December of the preceding year over that published for December of the second preceding year, adjusted to the nearest 1/10 of 1 percent.

"(II) For the purpose of subclause (I), 'Consumer Price Index' means the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, U.S. City Average, Housing Component (1967=100), prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.".

(f)(1)(A) Subchapter II of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 5724a the following new section:

"§ 5724b. Taxes on reimbursements for travel, transportation, and relocation expenses of employees transferred

"(a) Under such regulations as the President may prescribe and to the extent considered necessary and appropriate, as provided therein, appropriations or other funds available to an agency for administrative expenses are available for the reimbursement of all or part of the Federal, State, and city income taxes incurred by an employee, or by an employee and such employee's spouse (if filing jointly), for any moving or storage expenses furnished in kind, or for which reimbursement or an allowance is provided (but only to the extent of the expenses paid or incurred). Reimbursements under this subsection shall also include an amount equal to all income taxes for which the employee, or the employee and spouse, as the case may be, would be liable due to the reimbursement for the taxes referred to in the first sentence of this subsection.

"(b) For the purpose of this section, 'moving or storage expenses' means travel and transportation expenses (including storage of household goods and personal effects

under section 5724 of this title) and other relocation expenses under sections 5724a and 5726(c) of this title.".

(B) The analysis for chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 5724a the following new item:

"5724b. Taxes on reimbursements for travel, transportation, and relocation expenses of employees transferred.".

(2) Section 5724(i) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "5724a" and inserting in lieu thereof "5724a, 5724b,".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be carried out by agencies by the use of funds appropriated or otherwise available for the administrative expenses of each of such respective agencies. No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated by the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) The amendments made by this Act shall take effect beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) The President shall, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, prescribe the regulations required under the amendments made by this Act, and such regulations shall be made effective as of such date of enactment.●

NATIONAL POW-MIA RECOGNITION DAY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, along with my colleague the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), I have introduced legislation designating July 20, 1984, as "National POW-MIA Recognition Day," for commemoration of the sacrifices and the struggle of our American prisoners of war and missing in action.

For the past several years, the Congress has requested the President to authorize and issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities. We have been honored by the massive participation in the ceremonies all across our Nation, and have been grateful for the cooperation of the President, the Pentagon, and the Congress. We are asking that similar ceremonies and observances be scheduled for the next year, to commemorate the extreme hardships that our prisoners of war, from all conflicts, and our missing Americans have done in the name of freedom.

Of particular interest to the Congress is the plight of the 2,500 Americans still missing in Southeast Asia. With the increased priority in all the Federal Government agencies dealing with the POW/MIA issue, we have been working to make certain that the POW/MIA issue stays before the public, and that these Americans are not forgotten. In recent days, we have raised the priority and focused our Nation's attention on the resolution of the many cases which are still agonizing to the services and to the families of our missing.

This legislation is an appropriate way to call attention to the sacrifice and continuing tragedy of our American prisoners and the missing. I urge all our colleagues to join with us in cosponsoring this bill and to insure timely consideration.

The resolution follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION—DESIGNATING JULY 20, 1984 AS "NATIONAL P.O.W.-MIA RECOGNITION DAY"

Whereas the United States has fought in many wars;

Whereas thousands of Americans who served in such wars were captured by the enemy or are missing in action;

Whereas many American prisoners of war were subjected to brutal and inhuman treatment by their enemy captors in violation of international codes and customs for the treatment of prisoners of war and many such prisoners of war died from such treatment;

Whereas it is uncertain whether those Americans missing in action are alive or dead and such uncertainty has caused their families to suffer acute hardship; and

Whereas the sacrifices of American prisoners of war and Americans missing in action and their families are deserving of national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That July 20, 1984 is designated as "National P.O.W.-M.I.A. Recognition Day", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.●

OPINION POLL FROM CALIFORNIA'S 43D DISTRICT

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, during April of this year, I sent a questionnaire to my constituents in California's 43d District. Ten questions, addressing various issues of national concern, were presented for their consideration. I would like to take this opportunity to inform my colleagues of the results of this poll.

First, let me explain the method by which I arrived at these results. All registered voters in my district were mailed a copy of the questionnaire. From the 11,000 opinion ballots returned, 1,000 were randomly selected, and from those random samples the percentage figures listed below were derived. As anyone versed in the science of statistics can explain, such a large random sample more than adequately estimates the actual percentage results of all the respondents.

Here are the results:

1. Do you favor removing federal controls on the price of natural gas? Yes—48.1%; No—51.9%.

2. Do you think the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) should be made part of the United States Constitution? Yes—46.4%; No—53.6%.

3. Do you support President Reagan's efforts to rebuild America's defenses? Yes—52.6%; No—47.4%.

4. Do you favor banning the sale of government land for future offshore oil leasing? Yes—53.6%; No—46.4%.

5. Should able-bodied welfare recipients be required to work for their benefits? Yes—75.3%; No—24.7%.

6. Should there be less federal involvement in the education of our children? Yes—75.7%; No—24.3%.

7. Would you support imposing sanctions against employers who knowingly hire illegal aliens? Yes—62.3%; No—37.7%.

8. Would you support the bullet train proposal as a means of alleviating traffic congestion problems? Yes—58.4%; No—41.6%.

9. Do you support continued United States aid to El Salvador and Central America? Yes—49.4%; No—50.6%.

10. Should Congress repeal the "indexing" provision which would annually adjust income tax brackets to offset inflation? Yes—29.9%; No—70.1%.

This high level of response demonstrates the level of interest that my constituents have continued to demonstrate throughout the 98th Congress. These ever-watchful citizens have never hesitated to call to my attention those matters which they find to be of both local and national importance. I am deeply honored to be their voice in Congress.●

RAPID CHANGES IN WORLD ECONOMY AND TECHNOLOGY

HON. STAN LUNDINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, the United States is involved in a more intense international competition than ever before, and we are losing. Whereas this country emerged from World War II as the preeminent industrial and economic power in the world, we now find ourselves being challenged on all fronts. Rapid changes in the world economy and in technology are going on all around us, and yet, in the midst of what could conceivably be the most exciting time in our economic history, we find ourselves faced with aging factories, and noncompetitive methods of production. Competing nations are using the technologies that we have developed, while our factories struggle with outdated processes.

The fact is that our exporting companies are no longer in competition with foreign companies in a free market. Instead, they compete with foreign companies backed by their own governments in a market that is heavily distorted by targeting, trade

barriers, dumping, and restrictive regulations. Macroeconomic policies alone, no matter how sound, cannot deal effectively with the aggressive competitive techniques of other trading nations.

The United States must take action to put us on a level playing field with our foreign competitors. We can either ask our competitors to change their strategies for trading and competing, or we can change ours. Although it is very important that we initiate negotiations with our competitors, we cannot expect other nations to completely modify their very successful trade policies. It is up to the United States, as well, to take positive, aggressive steps to improve our own ability to compete in international markets.

Faced with the structural changes in the last 20 years, the predatory practices of our competitors, and the urgent need to maintain our international competitiveness, the United States cannot do without an industrial strategy; one which will replace the ad hoc, inconsistent patchwork of policies that are currently hindering the ability of our trading firms to compete effectively. Even as the long-awaited recovery begins, our trade and structural problems will remain. What the United States needs is healthy industry. A national industrial strategy is an essential element in achieving that goal.

A national industrial strategy is essential to getting American industry back on its feet, but it is not a panacea. An industrial strategy must be coupled by sound macroeconomic policies and effective, coherent programs if our economic policies are to be fully addressed.

It is, I believe, a serious mistake to try to put the trade problems in the context of free trade versus protectionism. The trade problems that we are now experiencing are unlike any that this Nation has ever experienced before. It is only with innovative and realistic solutions to those problems that we will achieve international competitiveness again.

I submit, for your consideration, an article by Mr. Lee Iacocca, chairman of Chrysler Corp., that was printed in the Washington Post, Tuesday, August 3. Mr. Iacocca, in my opinion, brings a very insightful perspective to the complex issues facing us in international trade. Although I am not endorsing Mr. Iacocca's proposals, I do commend his approach to the problem and his initiative.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 2, 1983]

WORLD TRADE: WHAT U.S. FIRMS ARE UP AGAINST

(By Lee Iacocca)

The playing field in world trade is not level; it is blatantly tilted against the United States.

And unless that field can be made level, we will rapidly slip from the major leagues to the minors—with small chance of a comeback. In 1982, the U.S. deficit in foreign trade was $43 billion; for 1984, Martin Feldstein, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, predicts that this deficit could reach $100 billion. This widening gap between imports and exports significantly contributes to lost jobs and the erosion of the capital base of many essential industries, including machine tools, steel, electronics and automobiles.

A strong economic recovery—contrary to popular economic folklore—could worsen this deteriorating situation. Since several major competitor nations are expected to lag behind the United States in their rate of recovery, price competition from them could play havoc with our recovery and our trade deficit.

With good reason, government and business leaders are concerned. Unfortunately, this concern has become polarized into an either/or postion; protectionism or free trade.

For example, in The Post, Wolfgang Hager's defense of protectionism [Outlook, May 15], was followed by Bill Brock's response in defense of free trade [op-ed, June 13]. These essays—a microcosm of what's being played out daily in Washington, in academia and on the 6 o'clock news—are attempts to come to terms with the issue of international competition. But, like most extreme solutions, both are wrong.

For one thing—and this is probably the most important thing—these either/or approaches fail to take into account some very basic realities of the business world in 1983.

It's true that protectionism would provide immediate, temporary help to certain industries—including the auto industry. About 28 percent of the cars sold in America are imported—21 percent are from one nation, Japan. And in June of this year, the Labor Department ruled that an estimated 5,200 workers laid off from Chrysler Corporation plants in Newark, Del., and Detroit can apply for special aid because imports cost them their jobs.

But rushing in with an across-the-board protectionist quick fix could backfire on American business. America simply can't afford to alienate and lose world markets through protectionism and its backlash. The fastest-growing markets in the world are overseas; Brazil and Mexico combined will probably represent a larger auto market than the United States at the turn of the century. And economies in the Far East are on impressive growth curves.

Like the ill-fated Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, protectionist measures carry the potential for lost markets, trade wars and depression. The price of such "relief" is one that American business can't afford.

If protectionism isn't the answer to our trade problems, free trade extremism isn't either. Free trade ignores the historical fact that current trade agreements were formulated at a time when America was the top dog in production and sales in world markets—and especially in domestic markets. It ignores the new reality that, both in terms of production facilities and marketplaces, competition is now global.

There is nothing wrong with the new game; it's really the major leagues. Global competition—the playout of economic Darwinism—has been a potent spur to American business to improve its productivity and quality. What is wrong is that while American companies are playing in a new international trade game, the U.S. government is still expecting them to play by the old rules.

We are up against aggressive, potent competitors, backed by their governments—while experts inside and outside government intone Adam Smith's theories and pretend it's still 1950 in terms of U.S. worldwide economic dominance. Most other governments have realized that the game and its rules have changed—and now assist the "Invisible Hand" through all-too-visible programs and policies that give their industries a better-than-even break in the world.

Because the U.S. government still tries to play by the old free trade rules, America lacks a trade policy that's responsive to the new realities of international competition. For American businessmen and workers—sent out into the global marketplace to compete without help from government—the playing field is not level; it's tilted against them.

To make that playing field level—to allow American business and American labor to be on the same footing with their global competitors—we have to address two major areas immediately.

The first area concerns purchasing power parity. Right now—because of currency exchange rates and the system of value-added taxes—some of our competitors have a substantial pricing advantage; over $1,500 per car for Japan. This advantage obviously tilts the playing field for the competition.

Exchange Rates: With the current strength of the dollar and the intentionally low values of certain other currencies, such as the yen, some of our trading partners have a big edge over American businesses when they compete in the U.S. market. In the auto industry—a prime example—it is estimated that the Japanese have a cost advantage of $600 to $800 per car because of an estimated 20 percent undervaluation of the yen.

Value-Added Taxes: Most of America's major competitors use value-added taxes, which they rebate to their manufacturers when goods are exported. For Japan, this tax rebate equals another $600 to $800 per car. U.S. import duties come nowhere near equaling the rebated taxes, so the imported goods have a substantial price advantage over American-produced goods. And the American goods have to shoulder the full effect of U.S. federal, state, local, Social Security, and other taxes.

The second major area concerns the lack of a coherent, pragmatic industrial policy to help American businesses to become and/or remain competitive—especially for:

Riding Out Downturns. Many of America's competitors have developed programs to help their industries remain solvent during cyclical downturns. America has no such program, and with each economic downturn—even predictable ones in cyclical industries like chemicals and autos—American industries lose ground to foreign competition. Once they lose too much ground and get on to a precarious financial footing, they usually cannot be resurrected. Their jobs disappear overseas forever, by the hundreds of thousands.

Carving Out and Preserving Market Share. Some of America's competitors, such as the Japanese, have learned that they can establish market share through a low price/low profit game plan applied over the long term. They can only do this with solid financial backing from their governments and their closely integrated national banking systems, something American industry doesn't have. As a result, American businesses frequently cannot afford to pay the

long-term "entry fee" to gain and hold position in desirable markets.

That these two areas—purchasing power parity and industrial policy—demand action is obvious to many Americans, but not to enough of our elected representatives. According to recent polls conducted by Louis Harris Associates and the Los Angeles Times, the percentage of Americans who favor government policies to preserve or expand our industrial base is double the percentage of congressional leaders who are similarly inclined.

What must government and business do, starting today, to deal with the new trade realities and to level out the playing field?

1. Government must negotiate more acceptable exchange rates, rates that reflect the real purchasing power of different currencies and that are indexed over time to changes in relative inflation rates.

2. Government must find ways to compensate for the pricing edge created by VAT rebates. DISCs (Domestic International Sales Corporations) have never been an effective tool for this; and import duties, because they are too low, have been equally ineffective. Our taxation policy should get in step with the rest of the world.

3. Government and business together must find ways to help fundamentally viable American companies absorb the impact of recessions—and to allow American business to compete with foreign industries whose governments and infrastructures support low price/low profit marketing strategies.

This kind of aid could be in the form of loans or of loan guarantees similar to those provided to Chrysler. a new structure to accomplish this program could incorporate the concept of a "domestic IMF"; it could arrange emergency financing to support those businesses that have clear, workable plans to improve productivity and increase operating efficiency. There's no question that the capital for these loans is available; I've often wondered why the American public and business community have allowed American banks and public institutions to lend $500 billion to Third World countries and businesses while we have such pressing needs here at home.

In the international trade game, time is not on our side. The next several seasons will determine, irreversibly, whether America stays in the world trade major leagues. We need solid policies now, if we're going to have a chance to play on a level field.

As far as autos are concerned, until we get these policies in place, we must negotiate or legislate an extension on quotas on Japanese imports. Without these quotas as an interim measure, the American auto industry as we know it won't survive long enough to have a chance to play on that level field.

A level field means a fair game—a game in which all players go by equivalent rules. A level playing field in international trade is necessary to put the biggest game in the world back on the level.●

SUPPORT ENTERPRISE ZONES

HON. BEVERLY B. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, the State of Maryland has passed legislation utilizing the idea of enterprise zones, whereby economically depressed areas are allowed to give tax, grant, and loan incentives to companies willing to locate there. Two of the designated areas, Cumberland and Hagerstown, are in the district that I represent. This concept has widespread support in Maryland as a promising method of promoting economic development in areas with traditionally high unemployment.

Unfortunately, similar legislation on the national level seems to be temporarily stalled. As a cosponsor of the bill that would federally establish enterprise zones, I urge my colleagues to expedite passage of this legislation. I am pleased to note that Representative ROSTENKOWSKI has pledged to hold hearings on the bill this fall, and I hope that the Ways and Means Committee will report the measure.

The attached editorial from the August 1 Baltimore Sun describes the anxiety concerning enterprise zone legislation. I hope that Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI will make this a priority item for the Ways and Means Committee. At this point, I include the article:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 1, 1983]

"NO" TO ENTERPRISE ZONES

The idea of enterprise zones—designated sections of economically depressed areas with tax, grant and loan incentives to companies locating there—gained attention in President Reagan's 1982 State of the Union speech. But the Republican president has not placed a priority on winning legislative approval. And according to The Sun's Fred Barnes, Democratic leaders in the House are out to block the plan for partisan reasons.

This is ironic, since the same idea being shot down by House Democrats is being hailed by Maryland Democrats. While the president and Congress have dawdled, Mayor Schaefer last year persuaded Governor Hughes to back state enterprise zones as an economic development tool. So Maryland's enterprise zones are a reality, while the tug of war between the Republican White House and the Democratic House persists.

The big stumbling block is Representative Dan Rostenkowski, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. He doesn't like enterprise zones. It's not the program's flaws that trouble the chairman; it's the fact the president would take credit at election time for an enterprise-zone law. To Mr. Rostenkowski, party loyalty always comes first.

That is a sad commentary on the Democratic leadership in the House. The solid backing by Maryland Democratic leaders for enterprise zones should have shown fellow Democrats in Washington that this is an issue that transcends political boundaries. Enterprise zones are neither Republican nor Democratic (actually the concept is a British import). Boosting the fortunes of depressed cities and rural areas through tax and government grant incentives is not partisan, either.

Mr. Rostenkowski is wrong to use his power to block enactment of an enterprise-zone bill. He may think he is acting in the best interests of his party; Mayor Schaefer, Governor Hughes and other local Democratic officeholders across the country would disagree. Enterprise zones hold great potential as a means of reviving areas of chronic unemployment. House Democrats should end their partisan opposition before it boomerangs.●

CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE FALKLANDS

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article by Britain's leading columnist, Peregrine Worsthorne. It draws some interesting parallels between domestic opposition to Britain's liberation of the Falklands and the opposition here to President Reagan's policies to stop communism in Central America.

Mr. Worsthorne notes that opposition to the Falklands campaign was "part of a general reluctance to approve of any vigorous defense of the national interest." In writing of Michael Foot's neurotic passion for negotiation as a substitute for self-defense, he observes, "Any exercise of armed power sends him and his like into paroxysms of anguish. . . ."

In the debate last week on Boland-Zablocki, we heard a similar attitude expressed. Had Mrs. Thatcher listened to Mr. Foot and like-minded persons in this House, the British Fleet would still be sailing around the South Atlantic, the Falklanders would still be under the Argentine boot, and we would still be hearing calls for negotiation.

Negotiations do not take place in a vacuum; they are merely a reflection of the underlying power balance. It is no coincidence that the ostensible interest of the Sandinistas and Castro in negotiations surfaces at a time when the number of anti-Sandinista insurgents has grown to 10,000 or more and when the United States is moving to display its military power in the region. By sending a message to our adversaries that we are reluctant to defend ourselves against their aggression, we impede the chances for successful negotiations to resolve the crisis.

[From the London Sunday Telegraph, July 31, 1983]

IF THEY ARE ANTI, THEN I AM PRO

(By Peregrine Worsthorne)

At the beginning of the Falklands crisis I was by no means certain whether or not it made sense for Britain to go to war to recover the islands, and would have remained septical had not Mr. Anthony Wedgwood Benn, and other opponents of any use of force, at least by the West, come out so strongly against the despatch of the fleet. And when during the course of the Navy's long journey south my doubts surfaced, nothing allayed them more quickly than one of Mr. Foot's many inane speeches advocating negotiation. In other words, it was the line-up opposing the war which did

much more to convince me of its desirability than anything said in its favour.

No, this was not an irrational or prejudiced way of making up one's mind, since very often doing the wrong thing for the right reasons does make more sense than doing the right thing for the wrong reasons. The right reasons for not going to war over the Falklands were all practical ones to do with Realpolitik—cost, distance, strategic irrelevance and so on. But these were not the reasons given by Mr. Benn and Mr. Foot. Their motives for opposing the war were moralistic, part of a general reluctance to approve of any vigorous defence of the national interest.

If the Isle of Man were invaded, Mr. Foot would want to refer the matter to the United Nations rather than fight, just as he would prefer to see a UN peace-keeping force in Ulster rather than the SAS. Any exercise of armed power sends him and his like into paroxysms of anguish, unless it be by the Soviet Union or in support of revolution.

Unfortunately, if Britain had not decided to fight for the Falklands, it would have seemed to have been for those wrong reasons—a victory for national decadence and international appeasement, and once opposition to the war had been presented by the Left in its terms, no right-minded patriot could have any further doubt about its inevitability. Letting bellicose Galtieri win might have made some sense. But letting pacific Mr. Foot win was too much to stomach. The same syndrome, I fear, is going to help us make up our minds about the wisdom or otherwise of the United States's armed intervention in Central America.

As I wrote last week, a good practical case can be made for non-intervention. But listening last week to Mr. Foot, aided by Mr. Dennis Skinner, spewing forth all the Left-wing propaganda against American imperialism, etc., I became more and more convinced that the sooner President Reagan sends in the Marines the better. For whatever ill effects such intervention may cause, nothing would be as dangerous as allowing such rubbishy Left-wing arguments—"nothing is ever settled by force"—to seem to have triumphed.

Mr. Andropov is very lucky in this respect. When he decided, for sound reasons of *Realpolitik*, not to send the Red Army into Poland, there was no likelihood of his motives being misunderstood. But how different it would have been if there had existed in the Soviet Union a powerful moralistic lobby—a counterpart to the anti-Vietnam lobby in the US—opposing intervention on the grounds, say, that the Soviet Union must never again get bogged down in another Afghanistan. In those circumstances, he probably would have long ago felt compelled to intervene, for fear of seeming to have lost his nerve.

Left to his own devices, President Reagan, too, might well decide that non-intervention in Central America served the national interest of the United States better than intervention. But once let the antimilitarist—"nothing is ever settled by force"—lobby start monopolising the act, and restraint will become much more difficult, since then it is bound to give an impression of weakness. "No more Vietnams!"—that is the one cry which President Reagan must not seem to heed, because if he does, no shred of United States credibility as a protective power would long remain intact.

To be fair, the point I am trying to make applies just as much to the emotionalism of the reactionary Right as of the progressive Left. If the sensible Right finds itself compelled sometimes to support imprudent wars so as to deny the foolish Left its propaganda victories, so does the sensible Left find itself sometimes opposing prudent wars so as to deny the foolish Right its equivalent satisfactions. For example, I have several progressive friends who started by supporting the Falklands war, only to be turned against it by the jingoistic excesses of the *Sun* newspaper, rather as I started by opposing it, only to be turned in favour by the pacifist excesses of Michael Foot.

If not going to war can lend credence to dangerous Left-wing illusions about the inefficacy of force, so can going to war encourage a comparably undesirable Right-wing trigger-happiness. On that reckoning some progressive Americans, who might otherwise support sending the Marines into Central America, could well come down against the idea so as to avoid releasing excessive war hysteria which they fear as much as I fear the peace hysteria that would be triumphant if the Marines were not sent in.

Ideally, of course, statesmen should be strong enough to do what makes sense on the strict practical merits of each case, regardless of the psychological shadows cast. For my own part, I must confess to finding this almost impossible to do. Left to my own devices, for example, I would not have felt very strongly about the restoration of capital punishment, the practical objections to which are certainly very considerable. What turned me into a convinced pro-hanger were the wholly untenable moral arguments being propounded by the abolitionists and the stench of hypocrisy emanating from the likes of Roy Hattersley. Better restore the rope, I concluded, not so much to deter murderers as to break the spell of perniciously false doctrines about what the State is permitted to do in its own defence.

If the hanging debate had been conducted in a pragmatic spirit, I should have opposed restoration, just as I would have opposed the Falklands war had not that issue, too, been made an issue of principle, as is happening now with Central America. Conceivably President Reagan would be foolish and imprudent to attempt there a military solution. But such a course would not, repeat not, be immoral. And in arguing that it would be, the Left almost compels him to take the very risks which it wants to prevent, if only to vindicate his right to do so.

One moral stance breeds another. Because the Left inveighs indignantly against imperialism in all circumstances, the Right finds itself refusing to admit that it is ever inappropriate. To the Left's injunction, "You must never use force," comes the Right's no less unbending mirror-image reply, "You must always." The most imprisoning prejudices, I find, are not one's own, but those one adopts, as a kind of protective armour, in self-defence against other people's. If the Left did not exist I should be so very much more reasonable, as also, doubtless, would President Reagan.●

HYPOCRISY OR WISE USE

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, it was with great interest that I read today's Wall Street Journal editorial about the Audubon Society's natural gas drilling program on their own private wildlife refuge in Louisiana. I was compelled to pick up my most recent copy of Audubon magazine to confirm that I had read correctly their own scathing indictment of Secretary Watt's much less relatively aggressive program along the same lines. Since the Audubon Society recognizes that the moneys they make from natural gas production can fund their activities, it made me wonder why they were so adverse to the United States doing the same thing. I do not suppose they appreciate being placed in the same position as the Interior Department—that is, trying to figure out responsible ways to both protect the environment and provide jobs and income at the same time, but it is interesting that they have made this difficult choice. I commend the editorial to the Members' attention, and ask that it, along with the letter written by Secretary Watt, be included in the RECORD. Up in Alaska, we would call the Audubon Society's actions hypocritical. But then again, we also would recognize their zeal for conservation, which still is defined as "wise use."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1983.

Mr. THOMAS W. KEESEE, Jr.,
Chairman of the Board, National Audubon Society, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KEESEE: I have just read an article which brought to my attention again the marvelous job you have done in successfully and safely developing an oil field in your Rainey Wildlife Refuge in Louisiana. Your realization that energy production and wildlife can exist side by side, and your commonsense understanding of how even fragile wetland areas such as Audubon's Rainey sanctuary can sometimes tolerate a variety of uses without harmful effects, are worthy of commendation and support. The July 5, 1983, Eastern Shore News story about Audubon leasing its Rainey sanctuary to Conoco is enclosed.

As you know, many people believe there is something inherently incompatible about allowing oil and gas activities in wildlife areas. In the real world, however, it is heartening so see, when self-serving politics are not exploited, that the National Audubon Society shows leadership in energy production when it realizes its economic self-interest and overall benefit to resources.

I will appreciate your efforts to keep the National Audubon Society from criticizing the Reagan Administration for policies it obviously so thoroughly embraces for itself.

We at Interior have not made and will not make a large scale use of national wildlife refuges for mineral development. Indeed, we are very cautious in determining precisely which lands may be open to any public or economic use. But, as you recognize at the Rainey sanctuary, some refuge lands can safely and beneficially be open to certain kinds of mineral uses and, as your refuge spokesman said in the Eastern Shore News article, be better off because of it.

I note that the oil revenues produced from your wildlife sanctuary are used to enhance the Rainey area and other Audubon lands.

Federal revenues from public and economic activities on national wildlife refuges are distributed to benefit local governments as well as the refuges.

I am particularly proud of the outlook for the National Wildlife Refuge System because today's Federal refuge system has better operation and maintenance funding and management than at any time in history. At a time when government is being reduced, the National Wildlife Refuge System is enjoying substantial increases in funding. Morale is up, too, because Fish and Wildlife Service refuge managers realize that the Administration will never let the refuge system deteriorate.

The refuge system is the world's largest and most successful collection of lands devoted to wildlife, and I am determined to keep it that way. For that reason, I have asked Congress for an additional $22.7 million for fiscal year '84 to better care for the system.

Be assured that I will join with others to defend you against executives of your own organization or any others who oppose your exploitation of the Rainey sanctuary for oil and gas production, even though it would appear that the standard for protecting the resources at Rainey are less stringent than those we employ on Federal lands.

I urge you to follow through on your wise decision to permit oil and gas activity on your Audubon sanctuary by inviting the public to visit Rainey in Louisiana to see first hand how properly managed economic activities can beneficially coexist with wildlife.

Sincerely,

JIM WATT,
Secretary.

Enclosure.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 4, 1983]

RED-CRESTED DERRICKS?

Interior Secretary James Watt has just sent a letter to the chairman of the National Audubon Society, Thomas W. Keesee Jr., congratulating him for realizing "energy production and wildlife can exist side by side." Strangely enough, Audubon officials aren't pleased.

Mr. Watt discovered that the Audubon Society is tapping the energy reserves of its 26,000-acre Rainey Wildlife Refuge in Louisiana. Under leasing agreements with Audubon, Consolidated Natural Gas is producing gas and petroleum liquids on the property and Conoco recently conducted some exploration work that turned up a dry hole. Audubon is using the leasing revenues to maintain Rainey and other wildlife areas.

Of course, it's only natural for any landholder in the Louisiana wetlands to search around for possible oil or gas reserves. People who own land and have a need for income like to get some productive use out of their property. But, of course, the Audubon folks and others in the environmental movement haven't always been tolerant of others who want to put wild lands to more productive use. Certainly they haven't been tolerant of Mr. Watt's rather limited efforts to reduce restrictions on such use.

The latest issue of the Audubon magazine, for instance, carries a 43-page article, replete with photographs, about how Mr. Watt is trying to despoil the nation's wildlife refuges. "The refuge system," it says, "is in the hands of a development-oriented administration that seems determined to wring out every last dollar it can."

You would think that Mr. Watt would have been offended to hear such criticism from an organization that is itself wringing a few petrodollars out of its own wildlife habitats. But in his letter to the Audubon Society, Secretary Watt says he understands the belief that "there is something inherently incompatible about allowing oil and gas activities in wildlife areas." In good spirit he adds: "In the real world, however, it is heartening to see, when self-serving politics are not exploited, that the National Audubon Society shows leadership in energy production when it realizes its economic self-interest and overall benefit to resources."

"As you recognize at the Rainey sanctuary," he says, "some refuge lands can safely and beneficially be opened to certain kinds of mineral uses and . . . be better off because of it."

Glen Paulson, Audubon Society vice president in charge of its sanctuaries, didn't much care for Mr. Watt's "cleverly written" letter, terming some parts "sophistry." The Audubon Society, he said, is looking only for gas and light petroleum liquids, which is not the same as searching for crude oil. He didn't say, and we didn't have the heart to ask, what the society would do if, in looking for gas, it accidentally discovered another Prudhoe Bay.

Mr. Paulson also differentiates between refuge areas, such as the ones in which Audubon conducts grazing, trapping and commercial energy production, and "wilderness," which environmentalists have argued should be locked up untouched by human hands for the benefit of posterity.

For example, he contrasts the "resiliency" of many environments in the lower 48 states, which presumably include the wetlands once described to us by environmentalists as fragile, with the tundra of "resource-rich" Alaska, where "the greatest threat of inappropriate resource exploitation looms." Mr. Paulson also insisted that Audubon puts care of the wildlife and the natural environmental ahead of any commercial considerations and that Mr. Watt's priorities are the reverse.

But in his letter, Secretary Watt suggests the Audubon Society might take a lesson from the might strict federal environmental safeguards about energy development. "It would appear," he says, "that the standards for protecting the resources at Rainey are less stringent than those we employ on Federal lands." That ain't so says Mr. Paulson.

Despite this difference of opinion, however, Secretary Watt pledged to Audubon Chairman Keesee that "I will join with others to defend you against executives of your own organization or any other who oppose your exploitation of the Rainey sanctuary for oil and gas production."

And in his best it-seems-only-fair manner, Mr. Watt adds, "I will appreciate your efforts to keep the National Audubon Society from criticizing the Reagan administration for policies it obviously so throughly embraces for itself."

Who wants to bet on the chances of that?●

A VISION OF EXCELLENCE

HON. STEVE BARTLETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution to express that it is the sense of the Congress that it is the national policy that the Federal Government encourage excellence in education as a national priority. This resolution responds to the demands of the American people that the Federal Government reevaluate its role in national education policy. Over the last two decades, the Federal role has been one of greater and greater intervention in the affairs of local schools. The assumption behind this Federal intervention has been that more Washington dollars and a more extensive regulatory role by the Federal Government is consistent with quality public education. Clearly, this assumption is wrong.

My resolution recognizes the important and legitimate role that Washington must take in providing leadership and appropriate support for sound education policy. But it goes beyond the tired dogma of the status quo that all contemporary education problems can be solved with more Federal dollars being concentrated in existing Federal programs. It embraces and acknowledges new ideas on the "cutting edge" of education policy development—ideas that can breathe new life into the Nation's education system.

Most importantly, the resolution identifies the encouragement of excellence in education as the primary priority of Federal education policy. It goes further by restating the danger that a less-than-excellent education system poses for the United States; it clearly reaffirms the appropriate relationship of the Federal Government to State and local governments in education: The Federal Government has the obligation to provide the leadership and support necessary for States and local schools to implement programs of educational excellence; however, the States and local school systems retain the primary responsibility—with parents—for education policy implementation; it states that rich and diverse resources should be incorporated into the public education process—from parents and grandparents to corporation and community groups; and it reminds the Congress and the American people that education policy at all levels of government should seek to elevate every aspect of society to embody its highest ideals. Of equal importance, the resolution retains the guarantees of equality, equity, and accessibility to education for all and recognizes the role of the Federal Government in providing financial assistance to needy students.

Mr. Speaker, as so often happens the American public is leading the congressional debate. The people are demanding that the Congress break out of the comfort of the status quo and design Federal education policy so as to encourage excellence in education.

We can use this resolution as a starting point by, in its own language, encouraging "all Americans * * * to join in a new social contract dedicated to excellence in education."

I would like to share with my colleagues an excellent editorial that appeared recently in the Christian Science Monitor that offers a thoughtful discussion of "A Vision of Excellence" in education, a vision that is contemplated by my resolution.

The editorial follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 11, 1983]

A VISION OF EXCELLENCE

If American voters suddenly fancy that in some fundamental sense they are back in the classroom—they are right. Polls show education emerging as a key issue in the coming presidential election, right alongside unemployment, protecting U.S. jobs from overseas competition, and inflation. And not surprisingly, political leaders are taking careful note of those findings. Turn on the evening news, for example, and there is President Reagan, talking with high school students in a classroom out in Farragut, Tenn. Or Walter Mondale, John Glenn, or Ernest Hollings urging a massive infusion of federal funds to help pull up America's educational socks.

The sudden attention to education is welcome, provided that the debate focuses on the real issues facing the nations' schools and does not lapse into a contest for votes based on blatant political considerations—with rival candidates seeking to build differing education-oriented constituencies: pitting, for example, teachers against administrators or teachers' union against teachers' union; college-bound students against job-bound students; voters who have no school-age children against parents. The point is that the United States is being alerted to rethink its educational priorities. But it needs to do so in an intelligent, comprehensive way that seeks out the broadest possible solutions geared toward unifying society and actually promoting the educational changes needed.

What are the fundamental issues?

EXCELLENCE

In large part, of course, the issue is one of ensuring that young people gain those intellectual and social skills necessary for an increasingly high-technology, computerized society. That means developing individual competence in such areas as grammar, mathematics, public discourse—the so-called educational "basics." In this regard, many of the recommendations of the National Commission on Excellence in Education make good sense—namely, higher academic standards, better pay for teachers, stricter discipline, and, in some instances, more homework and a longer school year.

That is not to say that various "life-style" courses are not important. They are, and they can provide essential information that young people need in today's fast-paced society. Vocational education courses are also important, particularly to the 48 percent of high school graduates who do not go on to college. Vocational courses help prepare a student to be a productive part of the economy, certainly a desirable individual and collective goal.

Perhaps most important, however, is the need to ensure that young people develop thinking and reasoning skills, the qualities necessary for socially acceptable behavior and responsible citizenship—community service, making wise choices in the election process, fostering constructive change in society.

EQUALIZING ACCESS

The educational battle of the 1960s and 1970s was over the issue of access, ensuring that the poor and disadvantaged—and to a large extent that meant minorities and the handicapped—were not unfairly left out of the American mainstream. Millions of hitherto deprived youngsters are now attending schools that in terms of equipment, classroom size, books, and staff are far superior to anything they might have had in the past. But the battle is far from over. Test scores, for example, continue to show disparities between children in many inner city schools and their suburban counterparts.

BROADENING THE BASE

The educational process needs to be opened up to all segments of society having a stake in schools—parents, grandparents, retired persons with free time, and corporations and community groups that both require special skills and can teach them to younger persons. Museums, libraries, and community youth groups can also be enlisted in public service programs.

FEDERAL ROLE

A strong federal initiative should be maintained to ensure access of all children to the best possible education as well as to help promulgate national standards where appropriate. The Department of Education could develop incentive programs designed to improve teaching and administration, such as merit pay for teachers and master teacher plans (now underway in some states).

These incentives will be discussed in a subsequent editorial. But in the long run a crash infusion of federal (or even local) funds—as advocated by Democratic presidential candidates—will not by itself be the answer to the nation's educational challenge. Perhaps more important than programs based on dollar outlays are efforts aimed at tapping the talent and cooperation of the local communities. Public service programs need not cost much.

Finally, beyond all the governmental and political precriptions for shoring up the American educational process must be a public recognition that teaching is a way of loving children—and shaping the future. Adults need to see themselves as the guardians of America's great experiment in universal public education, a process that encompasses not just the school system but all forms of communication and learning, including television and radio, newspapers, the pulpit. Such a vision of education means not only voting the taxes necessary to ensure the best instruction in the classroom—but elevating every aspect of society to embody its highest ideals.●

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, recently the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union has deteriorated at an alarming rate. Vicious anti-Semitic propaganda, often under the guise of anti-Zionism, is manifest in the formation of an Anti-Zionist Committee of the Soviet Public.

The history of the relationship between the Soviet regime and Jews in that country has been a history punctuated by deplorable incidents of persecution. In 1946, for instance, and again in 1952-53, the Government encouraged a violent campaign against the Jewish people.

Today the dire situation demands international condemnation. The crime perpetrated against Soviet Jews is a deeper phenomenon than sporadic acts of repression. Along with the sharp abridgment of emigration permission, official attacks on the Hebrew culture and religion have intensified. Recalling the infamous anti-Semitic forgery "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion," a book has been published and has received critical acclaim entitled "The Class Essence of Zionism." The following editorial from the Washington Post of July 1, highlights the iniquity of such developments in the Soviet Union today:

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

That was a shocking report by The Post's Moscow correspondent, Dusko Doder, about a new, crudely anti-Semitic book published in the Soviet Union. The shocking part was not so much the content—gutter racism in pseudo-schodarly guise is, unfortunately, not the monopoly of any one country. It was to have such a book emerge and be hailed in a country where no book is published without state sanction. The book and the evident campaign of which it is a part indicate a readiness on the part of the Soviet authorities to use anti-Semitism as an instrument of official policy. This is being done notwithstanding the offense that publication was bound to give to decent people in the Soviet Union and abroad.

Precisely what official Kremlin purpose is served by a book like "The Class Essence of Zionism"? One possibility is to stir anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism—the book appears to make no practical distinction between the two—to keep Soviet Jews from trying to exercise their right to emigrate; no Jewish emigration is being permitted these days. A second is to flash an additional caution to would-be individual dissidents and members of other non-Russian ethnic groups in the Soviet Union. A third is to buy a little cheap popularity with certain vulnerable elements in Soviet society.

Or maybe it is simply a police game or an internal political ploy. One cannot know these things. In particular, one does not know how Yuri Andropov fits in. As head of the KGB for 15 years before he became the top Soviet leader, he was deeply identified with policy toward Jews.

The only good thing about this book is that some Soviets are among those repelled by it. Reporter Doder found it was too much even for one of the members of a committee the authorities recently organized to advance the official "anti-Zionist" campaign. At a press conference, one person on the committee evaded a question about the book, but another said: "This committee in the future will fight against wild and wrong accusations in books which have been written by a few authors and unfortunately have been permitted to be published."

Let there be no confusion about the complete control the Kremlin wields over an aspect of policy so domestically and internationally sensitive as the treatment of minorities. Just the other day Yuri Andropov won a nice little burst of Western applause for allowing the emigration of 15 Pentecostalists who had sought exit visas for 20-plus years; five of them had spent almost five years in the basement of the American Embassy in Moscow. He could end the Kremlin's latest sponsorship of anti-Semitism with one phone call.●

ENERGY POLICY—ON THE LOOKOUT FOR NEW PERSPECTIVES

HON. TOM CORCORAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, someone once said that the one thing you can be sure of is that "the conventional wisdom" on most subjects is usually wrong. This has always been the case on matters of energy policy. So it is important for those of us in Congress to listen carefully to those who challenge the conventional wisdom. This is especially true when these observers have a history of being far wiser than "the conventional wisdom."

One such man is Dr. S. Fred Singer, a brilliant man who has served as senior fellow to the heritage Foundation specializing in energy policy. Dr. Singer has now returned to his post as professor at the university of Virginia, but he will still be available to us through his writings. It was Dr. Singer who, years before most of his colleagues in the "analysis trade," concluded that the American consumer was far better off without Government oil price and allocation controls, Government "emergency planning," and other failed policies of the past.

This time he tells that the biggest beneficiaries of the strategic petroleum reserve (SPR) may not be our constituents but rather citizens of other countries. I must say that I continue to number myself among the boosters of a sizable SPR and it doesn't trouble me that its benefits might even extend internationally. As always, his analysis is worth considering in considerable detail.

One thought which occurred to me as I read this article is this: If the President were to decide, on his own, to flood our domestic oil market with SPR oil at a time of international supply insecurity, then the result of this action may well be far more effective and reliable for us as well as our allies than the allocation programs of the International Energy Agency (IEA), even though the SPR oil would never physically leave the United States. Dr. Singer conclusion is that the resulting price reduction of oil in the international market would be of great benefit to those of our allies who depend heavily on imported oil.

The IEA, in contrast to Dr. Singer, seems to me to be so devoted to the conventional wisdom that it is entrapped by it. For example, while we have gotten away from dependence on oil price and allocation controls in the United States, the IEA still believes they can work—they cannot—and that they benefit consumers—they do not.

Recently the IRA conducted a test, called AST-4, of its international allocation program. What concerns me is that the assumptions made by the IEA as conditions of this test were so removed from reality as to make the test biased toward regulatory solutions and away from effective, market-oriented ones. Nonetheless, our Department of Energy performed admirably under these conditions. But I am inclined to look closer at the IEA, its programs, its operations and its history. Perhaps it is good energy policy and good foreign policy. Or it may just be living off the now-discredited conventional wisdom of years ago. If this should prove to be the case, it may be good energy policy and good foreign policy to rethink our involvement with the IEA altogether. At a minimum, we should reexamine the IEA, including the participation of American oil companies in its programs which necessitates the Congress to statutorily provide a legal defense to potential antitrust suits. It is my intention to solicit Dr. Singer's help, and the help of others in this regard. Mr. Speaker, I will report back to the House as I develop a new analysis of the IEA and its programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Dr. Singer's August 3, Wall Street Journal article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 3, 1983]

OUR STRATEGIC (FOR OTHERS) OIL RESERVE

(By S. Fred Singer)

It will come as a surprise to many that the U.S. strategic petroleum reserve, which is going to cost us about $30 billion, will help the Japanese more than us. Another surprising conclusion is that it is the Saudis, not just their customers, who should be building up an oil stockpile. But I'm getting ahead of my story.

In the unlamented days of the "oil crisis," when oil prices were controlled and people still believed in oil embargoes, the SPR was conceived as the first line of defense against an oil cutoff. This major Energy Department program was predicated on the idea that in case of any kind of supply disruption, oil from the SPR would replace imported oil—barrel for barrel. Suppose our imports from the Persian Gulf, now about 1.5 million barrels a day, were suddenly stopped. The SPR (now holding 300 million barrels, and eventually to reach 750 million barrels) would make up the shortfall for 200 days, and eventually 500 days. The arithmetic is impeccable; the logic is not. Yet many analytic models are built on this simplistic notion, and learned academics from renowned institutions have published on "optimality," "stochastics," "game theory" and so on.

The international oil trade doesn't work that way. Maybe this should have become obvious during the much-publicized 1973 Arab oil embargo—though directed against the U.S., it failed to cut off U.S. oil imports. Oil is fungible and was simply swapped out by oil companies and traders. Arab oil went elsewhere, and whatever excess oil this created for other countries ended up here. (The lines at gasoline stations were our own contribution to the "crisis"; they were caused by price controls and bureaucratic allocations.)

SUPPLY RESTRICTIONS

Of course, the world price went up once the Arabian oil countries restricted their production and created scarcity. But this had nothing to do with an unfriendly embargo declaration; it just turned out to be a friendly way to increase revenue and become richer.

It is important to understand that any supply restriction—for whatever reason, whether intentional or accidental—will raise the price of oil, and must do so for all consumers and producers in the world. This price rise is really all that matters; it measures the expected severity of the interruption.

For example, the 1979-80 price increase following the fall of the shah was based on consumers' expections of future supply interruptions and price jumps.

This is the crux of the matter: A supply cutback raises the price for everyone—even for those countries that don't import oil. (We must assume, of course, no price controls and no restrictions on imports and exports.) This means that an oil disaster in the Middle East will raise prices in the U.S.—even if we import no Middle East oil and even if we import no oil at all. As the oil price rose abroad, U.S. producers would export oil to the highest bidder until the U.S. price reached the world price.

It becomes clear that the SPR's real job is not to replace lost imports; the market does that—at a price. The SPR serves to moderate the price rise. But since SPR oil is fungible too, it will limit the price rise of oil not just in the U.S. but world-wide. Prof. William Hogan of Harvard's Kennedy School has referred to oil stockpiling as a "help-thy-neighbor" program.

It is easy to see who loses and who gains as SPR oil moderates a world price rise caused by some kind of interruption. The U.S. consumer will gain from the not-quite-so-high oil price, but the U.S. producer will lose by failing to get as much for his oil—and so will the Treasury. (With the windfall-profit tax in existence, the average producer wouldn't retain much of the price increase anyway.) If our imports drop to zero, then the consumer gains just balance the producer losses, but other consumers around the world still gain.

That's where the Japanese come in. There aren't any oil wells in Japan; Japan's per-capita imports are about four times those of the U.S. So it's all gain for them—thanks to the U.S. SPR and the U.S. taxpayer who paid for it. If we assume that the release of SPR oil limits the price rise by $5 a barrel against what it would have been without the release, Japan would benefit to the tune of $8 billion in one year. The average Japanese would benefit four times as much as the average American. (This ratio will hold no matter which countries release their stockpiled oil.) As the largest per-capita im-

porters, the Japanese get the largest "free ride" from any SPR, including ours.

Conversely, some producers will lose: Algeria, for example, and other producers with small reserves that would like the price of oil to go as high as possible while they still have oil.

Producers with large oil reserves have quite a different problem. Saudi Arabia, for example, shouldn't want the price to rise too high. That would encourage consumers to find alternatives to oil and hurt the Saudis' long-term market. This is happening now as a result of 1979's spectacular price increase. From the Saudi point of view, there is a sort of optimal price schedule over time that—to paraphrase Colbert—plucks the consumer's goose to obtain the largest amount of feathers, but doesn't make him hiss too much. While an increase above the optimum price certainly raises profits in the short term, it fosters conservation and cuts long-term profits for those who care—and Saudi Arabia does, or should, care.

If we carry this thought to its logical conclusion, it argues for a giant oil stockpile to be set up and controlled by Saudi Arabia for the express purpose of stabilizing the world price. The oil must be removed from its geological formation and placed in storage, preferably outside of Arabia, in tanks or in underground caverns, to be accessible for rapid pumping when the Saudis see a need to put more on the market than they can produce at full capacity. Another scenario might be one in which exports from the Arabian peninsula are stopped, for any of a variety of reasons.

A Saudi stockpile has the additional value of providing them with a nest egg abroad, which is better than money in the bank. The Saudis can get the oil at their marginal cost of production, probably at below $1 a barrel, and sell it at a much higher price during an oil disruption. Furthermore, it is a good way for them to use their excess production capacity and the associated natural gas, without actually putting the oil on the market today and upsetting the price—and their fellows at the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries.

In 1976, while a consultant to the Treasury, I proposed such a system and worked out some financial and logistic details. My hope was to persuade Saudi Arabia of the wisdom of such a project in protecting its long-term future. It could have used such a stabilizer stockpile in 1979.

EXERCISE THE SPR

What should be done now that we have an SPR and are making it larger? My advice is to make the best of it. We probably will never persuade Congress to do without it. And it is a good psychological crutch to reassure the public that an oil interruption can be handled without price controls, ration coupons or emergency-allocation powers in the White House. Anyway, private stockpiling probably will never work in a political climate where the confiscation of "windfall profits" of "hoarders" and "speculators" is almost a certainty. Predictably, a governmental SPR overhanging the market reduces the incentives for private companies to hold strategic inventories.

I am concerned that the SPR will just sit there, getting fatter and more costly, while the government waits for that "rainy day" that may never come. I favor exercising the SPR—despite opposition from those who don't want to release a drop of oil because of exaggerated security concerns. Certainly, it should be fully tested, physically and administratively. We should know what factors limit the maximum rate of oil release: pumps, pipelines or suitable purchasers.

We also should recognize that release of small amounts of SPR oil can, under certain circumstances, depress the world price for all oil by putting pressure on OPEC, especially if coordinated with similar releases by our allies in the International Energy Agency. Under the expectations that oil demand will continue to decline because of conservation and that prices will fall, it becomes profitable to sell stockpiled oil dear and buy it back cheap. This may be the time when oil consumers can start exercising their market power and regain some of the revenue earlier transferred to OPEC.●

H.R. 3021

HON. DENNY SMITH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain why I voted against H.R. 3021 yesterday. I know it is painful to lose a job. It hurts your pride and throws your whole life into turmoil and panic. I know because I was laid off myself several years ago as a Pan Am flight engineer. I was lucky enough to have a family business to fall back on, but most people are not that fortunate. Compound the already distressing situation of unemployment with high medical bills, and a family can find itself in a terrible financial bind.

Members on both sides of the aisle understand the plight of the unemployed. The real question is how we deal with their problem in the most compassionate and responsible manner possible. Mr. Speaker, careful analysis will show that an expensive health care plan for the unemployed is neither compassionate nor responsible. Moreover, it is one of the cruelest and most shortsighted things we could do to the unemployed in this Nation.

To really understand unemployment and deal effectively with it, we need to look at the broader picture and the root causes of lost jobs. Congress approach to the problem is to throw money at it, just like we did by passing the jobs bill earlier this year, hoping that somehow it will help the unemployed find permanent jobs.

We already have one of the best jobs programs in place and it is not costing the taxpayers a dime. As a matter of fact, it could help reduce the Federal budget deficit. It is too bad the liberals do not like it and that it has not received the recognition in the press that it deserves. What jobs program am I talking about? It is the economic recovery that is sweeping this Nation. Since December, 800,000 workers have been added to industrial payrolls. This good news is only surpassed by the fact that we can anticipate even greater numbers of job openings in the months ahead because of the vigorous pace of the economy. I am sure my colleagues greeted the news of an 8.7-percent annual growth rate with the enthusiasm I did. The economy is picking up steam, and with it new jobs will be created for the unemployed.

But economic recovery may falter unless Congress is willing to control Government spending. At some time Congress must face up to the fact that we cannot afford to spend money we do not have. This concept seems simple enough to understand, most of us preach this philosophy to our constituents back home, but when it comes to taking action, Congress has a difficult time exercising the restraint necessary for fiscal responsibility.

The problem is that we continue to create spending programs without any means of funding them. We continue to borrow money thinking the bills will never come due. It is shocking to think that 25 cents out of every dollar the Federal Government spends is borrowed. Maybe we will not pay the price, but our children will, and their children, too. I cannot think of any action more irresponsible for the leaders of this Nation to take.

Ironically, this behavior is one of the very reasons why the people we are talking about today are unemployed. Uncontrolled Government spending has resulted in massive budget deficits which impact interest rates. Economists may disagree on the exact effect of Government borrowing on interest rates, but even commonsense tells us that if the Government is borrowing most of the available credit, businesses and consumers will have to pay higher interest rates on the remaining funds for purchase of capital equipment, automobiles, and homes.

In my home State of Oregon there is no worse news than when interest rates go up. We live and die by the prime rate. When interest rates went up to record levels 2 years ago, it crushed the housing and timber industries in our State, which are the lifeblood of our economy. Unemployment climbed above the national average and people became despondent. The economic recovery of recent months has given Oregonians a sense of hope. The unemployment rate has now fallen to 9.1 percent, the lowest rate in years.

I fear this bill, even with all of its good intentions, could jeopardize economic recovery, resulting in more unemployment for my State. I also think this bill comes too late to do any good. Enacting this legislation now could only hurt our efforts to put people back to work. If you ask a guy whether he would rather have his job back or this health insurance program, he will tell you he wants his job. He does not want Government welfare; he wants to pay his own way.

It is time for Congress to put aside its misguided notions that more spending will help this guy find permanent employment. Passing this legislation is shortsighted. It could create even bigger problems for us to solve down the road.

I fear that once this program is in place, we will never get rid of it. Proponents assure me that it is only a temporary measure, but I doubt it. Experience tells us that once the program is in place, interest groups will form to promote it and Congress will want to keep it. Passage of this legislation may be the first step toward national health insurance, which would be disastrous for all of us.

My colleagues should look carefully at the price tag attached to this legislation. Sponsors say it will cost a paltry $4 billion, but they know as well as I do that we do not even have that much in the Federal coffers to spend. And with health care costs increasing many times faster than the consumer price index, I would be willing to bet that this bill will cost the taxpayers much more than Congress ever anticipated.

Congress should also be wary of unintended side effects. For example, consider the bill's requirement that businesses provide 90 days' worth of health benefits for employees that are laid off. What if employers drop their health benefits rather than comply with the new law? Who benefits then? That idea may sound farfetched to some of my colleagues, but it does not to a businessman. Unlike the Federal Government, businessmen must be concerned about costs. If we make it too expensive for businessmen to carry health insurance for their employees, they will drop it.

Or what about the employee who works in a low-paying job where his employer does not provide any health benefits? Is this legislation fair to him? How can we justify passing this legislation without something for the low-paid worker who now foots the entire bill for his health insurance?

In our rush to show compassion and understanding for the unemployed, let us not lose touch with reality. Under the best of circumstances this legislation will provide health care for a few but at a high price this Nation cannot afford. In the worst case, it will become a costly entitlement program that will expand and haunt us for generations.

The best thing we can do for the unemployed is to insure that economic recovery continues so that new jobs are created. Congress can help the recovery by exercising fiscal restraint. Had we defeated H.R. 3021, as I advocated, we would have demonstrated a true commitment to the unemployed.●

BLACK COWBOYS RIDE AGAIN

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to highlight a part of history too many of us know too little about. That part is the part played by black cowboys. In my district is the Black American West Museum started by Paul Stewart, who was a cowboy. Mr. Stewart presides over a fascinating collection and I wish to insert in the RECORD this recent article describing that collection.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, July 17, 1983]

MUSEUM GIVES BLACK COWBOYS SPOT IN HISTORY

(By Roosevelt Leftwich)

Everyone has a hero, but Paul Stewart's hero is unique.

"If I had to pick somebody, I would have to choose Jesse Stall," said Stewart, who is curator of the Black American West Museum.

Stall was a cowboy at the turn of the century.

"He would ride a horse until it would stop, then he would either spur him in the side or pull up his tail to get him to buck all over again. He was one bad dude," said Stewart.

Stewart is the only tour guide at the museum, which he started after 21 years of collecting black Western memorabilia from across the country. Everything from saddles to shaving brushes is displayed at the museum.

The museum at 3607 Martin Luther King Blvd. was visited by 3,500 people last year. Some items from Stewart's collection are on exhibit at the Belmar Museum in Lakewood and at IBM's offices in Boulder.

"I wish I had a bigger building because there is so much still to see," Stewart said.

Most of the museum-goers are children. And it's these special visitors who keep the 57-year-old Stewart going, he said.

"Oooooh, look at all the cowboy stuff—this stuff is real rusty because it's so old," said one child as he stared at a Civil War-vintage rifle. The 18 children who invaded the museum Friday were unusually silent as Stewart took the children on a little-known voyage through the American West.

With their eyes popping and mouths wide open in amazement, the children were the highlight of Stewart's busy day. He is an expert on blacks in the West and is listed in "Who's Who in Intellectuals."

"I like giving tours to the little ones—I mean they're so enthused," he said grinning. "Some of the things they say just make my day."

Stewart's fascination with blacks in the West began when he was growing up in Iowa.

"When I was little I wasn't aware that there were any black cowboys because when I would play with my little white friends, I always had to be the Indian and I wondered why," Stewart said. "I didn't see my first real black cowboy until I was grown."

After years of research, Stewart's collection has grown to more than 6,000 items, only a third of which is displayed in the cramped, one-room museum. The rest of the collection is carefully tucked away in boxes and file cabinets, which clutter his office.

"The purpose of this place is to make people aware that there was black input in the old West," Stewart said. "You can look at some Indian hand crafts and see the input blacks had in their lifestyle. They've even discovered African bells on the Oregon trail—the input was there but it just wasn't noticed."

The museum, which is the only one of its kind, receives no federal funds, he said. Most of the money raised to keep the museum going comes from private contributions, admission fees and revenue from Stewart's book, "Westward Soul."

"I feel we have something here that's very unique—it's Paul's dream," said Geraldine Stepp, development coordinator for the museum. "We as blacks have been supporting white museums for years and it's high time they supported us."

The museum's 10 emloyees are all volunteers, Stepp said. "All the time they put in is because they love what they're trying to accomplish," she said.

Stewart's collection also includes more than 700 recorded interviews with blacks who were a part of Colorado's pioneer days.

"Few people know that the land where city park is today was owned by the Whitsell family, who were very successful black farmers," Stewart added.●

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom to submit a statement of financial disclosure every year that I have served in the House of Representatives. While the law now dictates that Members of Congress submit financial statements in May of each year, I continue to file this more detailed family financial report. In this way, my constituents are kept fully informed concerning my financial status.

The statement follows:

Romano L. and Helen D. Mazzoli statement of financial worth as of Dec. 31, 1982

Cash on deposit:

Liberty National Bank & Trust Co. IRA Account No. 01-527329	$2,286.28
Lincoln Federal Savings & Loan, account No. 10373390	3,508.28
Northern Virginia Savings & Loan, account No. L-6084	237.45
Northern Virginia Savings & Loan, account No. 05-23-00192	1,236.66
Northern Virginia Savings & Loan, account No. 80507	1,728.50
Northern Virginia Savings & Loan, account No. 05-18-00241	664.58
Government Services S&L, account No. 01-112091-00	147.10
First Federal of Arlington, account No. 05-018470-4	11.53
Government Services S&L, money fund account, No. 89-800336-2	5,226,44

Securities, stocks and bonds:	
U.S. Government bonds, series E	1,441.48
U.S. Treasury bill, account No. CU6-2-400-40-3938-01	10,000.00
U.S. Treasury bill, account No. CU6-2-400-40-3938-01	10,000.00
Real property: Residential:	
939 Ardmore Drive, Louisville, Ky.:	
Assessed value	42,000.00
Less: Mortgage, the Cumberland Savings & Loan	8,403.10
Net value	33,596.90
1030 Anderson Street, Alexandria, Va.:	
Assessed value	102,300.00
Less: Mortgage, Cowger & Miller Co.	46,944.42
New value	55,355.58
Household and miscellaneous personal property (estimated)	7,500.00
Cash surrender value of life insurance policy:	
American United Life Insurance Co., Policy No. 1011729	4,578.50
American United Life Insurance Co., Policy No. 1116312	818.79
Federal Employees Retirement System: Contributions	48,436.93
Automobiles:	
1965 Rambler fair market value	100.00
1973 Chevrolet fair market value	1,047.00
Total assets	187,922.00
Less: Notes payable:	
Liberty National Bank & Trust Co.	5,332.87
National Bank of Washington	2,000.00
Total	7,332.87
Net assets	180,589.13

Income

Interest and dividends:	
U.S. Treasury bills (AE4-2-400-40-3938-01 & AX2-2-400-40-3938-01)	1,468.90
Liberty National Bank & Trust Co., IRA account No. 01-527329	223.47
Lincoln Federal Savings & Loan account No. 37339-5	225.52
Lincoln Federal Savings & Loan, All Saver No. CD-1-01-301084-OAS	1,215.55
American United Life Insurance Co., Policy No. 1116312	14.65
American United Life Insurance Co., Policy No. 1011729	23.18
Northern Virginia Savings & Loan, account No. 5-99-76	41.00
Northern Virginia Savings & Loan, account No. L-6084	12.85
Northern Virginia Savings & Loan, account No. 5-18-241	67.94
Northern Virginia Savings & Loan, account No. 80507	112.08
Northern Virginia Savings & Loan, All Saver No. 05-23-00192	95.20
Government Services Savings & Loan, account No. 89-800336-2	269.92
Government Services Savings & Loan, account No. 01-112091-0	122.31
First Federal Savings Assoc. of Arlington, account No. 05-018470-4	5.11
Total interest and dividends	3,897.68
Honorariums:	
Agricultural Producers, Inc.	1,500.00
American Federation of Government Employees	750.00
Grocery Manufacturers Association	2,000.00
Quaker Stove Co.	400.00
Brookings Institution	450.00
Kentucky Cable T.V. Association	1,000.00
American Immigration Lawyers Association	1,000.00
Kentucky Savings & Loan League	500.00
Coalition of Apparel Industries of California	750.00
Motion Picture Association of America	2,000.00
Total honorariums	10,350.00
Salary:	
U.S. House of Representatives (R. L. Mazzoli)	60,662.50
V.V.K.R., Inc. Architects (Helen Mazzoli)	16,045.98
Total salaries	76,708.48
Gross income	90,956.16
Income tax recapitulation (Federal, State, local):	
Federal:	
Gross income	90,128.00
Adjustments to income	7,702.00
Adjusted gross income	82,426.00
Deductions and exemptions	16,259.00
Taxable income	66,167.00
Tax withheld	20,810.00
Tax due	21,360.00
Kentucky:	
Tax withheld	2,727.00
Tax due	2,420.00
Refund	307.00
Virginia:	
Tax withheld	653.00
Tax due	301.00
Refund	352.00
Louisville and Jefferson County: Tax due	253.00

IN MEMORY OF WILLIE FRANK

HON. MIKE LOWRY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. LOWRY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, earlier this summer one of the great figures in the history of Washington State, Willie Frank, passed away. While most of us would consider a life that spanned 104 years to be a great achievement in itself, it is the quality of Willie Frank's life that was his greatest legacy.

Willie Frank's life was spent along the Nisqually River, which is located at the southernmost point on Puget Sound. The river has its origin at the Nisqually Glacier on Mount Rainier, and had been the home of the Nisqually Indians for hundreds of years before European exployers reached the Pacific Northwest. Like his ancestors before him, Willie Frank was a river fisherman who lived a simple life close to nature on his river.

In his lifetime, Willie Frank watched the once numerous runs of salmon dwindle. The coming of white civilization and the hydroelectric projects took their toll. Inadequate sport fishing regulations by the State of Washington were partly responsible. Through the years, Willie Frank consistently fought to protect his people's right to fish in the Nisqually River in their traditional fashion utilizing nets.

The passive, nonviolent fish-ins that occurred at Frank's landing in the early 1960's brought national attention to the fishing rights issue in Washington State. Years of litigation resulted in a U.S. Supreme Court ruling affirming the right of the Nisqually and other Northwest tribes to fish in their traditional manner and to have access to a fair share of the salmon runs as guaranteed in treaties signed in 1854-1855 by U.S. Territorial Governor, Issac Stevens.

In a very real sense, the treaty rights struggle had its origin at Willie Frank's tiny fish landing on the Nisqually River. This small track of land is home to Willie Frank's immediate family, which includes his wife Angeline, son Bill Jr., stepdaughter Maiselle Bridges and her daughters Suzette and Allison and their children. It is also the home of the Watle Lute Indian School, started almost 10 years ago on U.S. Army land adjoining Frank's Landing. Through the efforts of former U.S. Senator Warren Magnuson, that property was taken into trust by the Secretary of the Interior for Willie Frank and his heirs.

The hundreds of relatives and friends who mourn the passing of Willie Frank remember him as a man of peace, who was determined to maintain the traditional Nisqually ways. His lifelong battle to save the salmon has been passed on to the other family members, including Bill Frank, Jr., chairman of the Northwest Indian Fishery Commission. All of us have something to learn from the inspiring life of Willie Frank.

I know my colleagues will enjoy reading an article written by one of my constituents which appeared in a local Seattle newspaper on June 21, 1983.

The article follows:

WILLIE FRANK (1879-1983) AND THE PARADISE BEFORE THE WHITE MAN CAME

(By Tom Keefe, Jr.)

He was born Qu-Lash-Qud, son of Kluck-etsuh, Leschi's nephew, who along with his cousin, Wa-He-Lute, went to war rather than give up the land and life along the fer-

tile Nisqually River Valley for a patch of barren reservation away from the river and its salmon. Qu-Lash-Qud listened and learned: the white man must keep his promise. The Indian people need the river to survive. The Nisqually Tribe must stay near the river.

Last Friday brought wind and rain, patches of blue sky and hail, two rainbows, and a half moon. And in the season of long sunsets, Qu-Lash-Qud ended his journey among the river people and returned home. "Don't cry for me when I'm gone, son. I will be watching you. This is the way things must be. Don't cry for me."

Qu-Lash-Qud remembered when his mother went away. He was 2 years old. She left after giving birth to his sister. Many people cried for she was a young woman. But not Qu-Lash-Qud. He listened and learned. This is the way things must be.

Qu-Lash-Qud was raised by his aunt, Sally Jackson, the Nisqually Tribe's last Tamanawus woman. She had the spiritual powers that others did not possess. Sally Jackson had the medicine, and knew which roots and herbs and grass would make you well again. She knew to fast and meditate, and knew the other world of night. "Do not be afraid of the night, Qu-Lash-Qud. Our people are there. You can see them if you try. Take this medicine up the river to the person who needs it. The night is your friend."

An uncle sent Qu-Lash-Qud to the Catholic missionary school where he was baptized and told not to talk Indian any more. When they beat him for doing it, he ran away. He walked day and night, a little boy, home to Nisqually. He did not fear the dark, this boy they called Willie Frank.

Life was better at the Cushman School—700 Indian boys and girls. Willie joined the school band, and traveled the state performing with his schoolmates. He remembered nice hotels, good meals, and happy white faces. In later years, the grown man was told to leave these same places ("We don't serve Indians"). Willie Frank listened and learned. Years later, he would still pull out the old horn and "Alexander's Ragtime Band" would echo up the valley from his river landing, Frank's Landing.

For bureaucratic identification purpose, he was Willie Frank, Nisqually Allottee No. 89. Not that we cared much about the importance of his white name. When "Camp Louie" wanted his 205 acres, Pierce County eagerly condemned the reservation and pushed Willie Frank and the other Nisqually people across the river. Take the money and go away. Many did. But Willie Frank wanted land, so he bought six acres on the river where he could fish and watch and listen. He took care of the old people who were without food or shelter. He fed and clothed the Indian people who gathered at Frank's Landing.

Now they catch the salmon at the mouth of the river, not upstream like the Indians always have done. Smoke the fish in the longhouse until it is hard and will keep a long time. Soak it in the river overnight until is it nice and tender. Then boil it. "It was so nice and tender you could eat it without teeth," Grandpa Frank would say: The white man fished at the mouth of the river and built a dam upstream. The salmon went away.

Willie Frank never raised his voice in anger at any man. He never learned to shoot a gun and didn't resist when they came to arrest him. The State of Washington came first to arrest him in 1916 and many more times through the years. You can't fish the river with a net, Willie Frank—it's against the law. "Well, maybe so, but I've got a treaty, the Treaty of Medicine Creek in 1854 with my people. I'm Willie Frank, Nisqually Allottee No. 89. The state must respect my treaty rights." And so the battle was joined.

Others would show less patience in the years that followed. Tear gas and riot gear would be seen at Frank's Landing. Movie stars and network cameras. Big trouble at Willie Frank's little fish landing. Poor flood control and negligent stream-flow managment at Alder Dam began to eat away at Willie's six acres. "He would go off by himself into another room and lie down on his back with his arms outstretched and his eyes closed," his daughter Maiselle recalls. "He would be very still for quite a while, almost like he had left his body." I had always wondered about this so finally one day I asked him about it. He told me, "It's something I was taught by my aunt. It is to relax my mind." Calm at the eye of the storm.

At Bill Frank Jr.'s birthday party, one speaker noted that "every 50 years, there's one heck of a big storm around here and another Bill Frank is born." So it was that on Easter Day last year, Little Willie saw his first sunrise. Grandpa held the baby and talked to him in the old way. He listened to the boy, bounced him in rhythm to the Nisqually songs, and gave him his Indian name, Qu-Lash-Qud.

At Grandma Angeline's birthday party, a reporter asked Grandpa what he looked forward to doing in the days to come. "What I want to do now is to spend some time on the river." He could hear and feel and smell and taste the Nisqually River. The river was his source. Willie Frank and the river and the salmon were one. Will the salmon ever come back to Nisqually? Time will tell, but if he does—thank this man.

Between the waking hours and the coming of sleep, Qu-Lash-Qud saw and heard the old people gathering. Speaking the Nisqually way, gathered at the foot of his bed. "I think the time is coming for me to be with my friends, son. This is the way things must be."

In the last days, he was hungry for *Tyee*. The white people call him Spring Chinook. *Tyee* were once a common sight on young Qu-Lash-Qud's Nisqually River. He remembered hooking a 20-pound fish when he was six years old and bringing it to Aunt Sally to prepare for the elders. Nice and tender, you could eat it without teeth. Bill Jr. brought Grandpa salmon, but the hunger remained. "I always say, the Nisqually Indian was living in paradise before the white man came. Everything grew just natural. There were lots of roots, wild onions, turnips, and wild carrots. And one little black root that made all the others taste sweet. There was game, grouse, and wild berries, and everything."

Was Qu-Lash-Qud a chief? Well, you see, the Nisquallys didn't have chiefs. The territorial governor tried to deputize Leschi and the others as subchiefs for the purpose of signing the treaty. Leschi tore up the commission when he saw what they were trying to do. But that was a long time ago, and not many people remember now.

Qu-Lash-Qud remembered, and he reminded everyone who saw or heard him, He remembered it all. He was a holy man. He returned to the land on the first day of summer—the longest day of the year.

There is an intant between night and the coming of day when it is neither night nor day. It is a time of calm and peace where the two halves of the circle meet. Have you seen it? The Nisqually Indians call this time qu-lash-qud.●

TRIBUTE TO MALCOLM S. BROWN

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with Members some memories of Malcolm S. Brown, late of the District of Columbia and a long-time beloved employee of this House, who passed away last month on July 11.

Mr. Brown, or "Brown" as he was known, had served as barber and supervisor of the House barbershops for over 18 years, and barber for the Senate side for 2 years before coming on the House side. For as long as I can recall, Brown was always a pleasant man, always accommodating to Members and staffers as well who needed that last minute haircut before a last minute press conference, hearing, or appointment. He was especially courteous to me, as I am sure he was with all of my colleagues, during our discussions on floor issues—whether we agreed or disagreed on the topic.

I can admit my visits to the shop will never be the same without the warm and always friendly smile that Brown had for each customer, which ranged from staffer, to Members to an eventual President.

I extend my condolences to his family: his wife Daphne, his daughters Jan and Jewel, who was also an employee of this House recently with my Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy, and his grandson Gerard.●

H.R. 2817, A BILL TO AMEND THE CLEAN WATER ACT BY AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR THE CHESAPEAKE BAY

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I was asked to testify before the House Public Works Subcommittee on Water Resources on a bill I introduced earlier this year that would provide funds for the cleanup of the Chesapeake Bay. This legislation is an important step in restoring the bay's water quality and in dealing with all the interests in the Chesapeake Bay region.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN ROY DYSON

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Subcommittee, I am here today to

testify on behalf of H.R. 2817, a bill I introduced earlier this year that would amend the Clean Water Act to provide for the enhanced water quality of the Chesapeake and Narragansett Bays.

The Chesapeake Bay is one of our nation's most cherished and valuable natural resources. It is the largest and most productive estuary in the contiguous United States, with a drainage area of nearly 64,000 square miles in size, that includes parts of 6 states and the District of Columbia. Its primary tributaries, the Susquehanna, the Potomac, and the James Rivers are major river systems in their own right.

The Bay's significance extends beyond its size, to its importance for the seafood, waterborne commerce and water-oriented industries that are vital to the middle Atlantic states. I am particularly aware of this because of my responsibilities as the representative of Maryland's First Congressional District, which surrounds the largest portion of the Chesapeake Bay.

These local interests are complemented by the impact that the Bay has on the nation as a whole. Its fishing production is surpassed only by that in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, with an annual dockside value in excess of $100 million. Commercial shipping interests carried nearly 239 million tons of cargo via the Chesapeake in 1981, estimated at nearly $27.5 billion.

One of the Bay's most valuable roles is its function as a wildlife and aquatic habitat. Its tributaries are important places of reproduction for a variety of species of anadromous fish, like the shad and striped bass. In fact, almost 90 percent of the striped bass along the Atlantic Coast spawn in the Chesapeake's waters.

These facts indicate why the environmental quality of the Bay is so important to the region and the nation. As you probably know, next month the Environmental Protection Agency completes its seven-year, $27 million study of the Chesapeake Bay's water quality. The study answers many of the most pressing questions about the condition of the Bay, but those answers only point to how much more remains to be done.

Research findings have identified three areas of serious concern: toxics, nutrient enrichment and declining Bay grasses. These findings indicate that the main stem of this 195-mile long estuary is losing oxygen. In addition, the upper reaches of the main tributaries are considerably more stressed than scientists originally thought. All of these trends—the decline of the Bay grasses; the increased nutrient and attendant loss of oxygen; and the continued loading of toxic chemicals and heavy metals into Bay waters—portend serious problems by the end of the century.

The Bay grasses that once stretched from shore to shore are nearly gone. Commercial landings of striped bass plunged from five million pounds in 1973 to less than one million pounds in 1979. Shad, once harvested in huge numbers, are now so scarce that there is a rule against catching and keeping them in Maryland. In general, the fish that migrate each year to spawn in the Chesapeake Bay are disappearing.

This decline in water quality and subsequent loss of aquatic life has been principally the result of non-point source pollution; that is, agricultural and urban runoff, usually from heavy rainfall. Each year the Bay receives 400 million gallons of sewage and some 2,000 tons of metals and symbolic compounds, including sediments, fertilizers and herbicides.

Given the EPA findings, it is essential that we have a shared federal and state commitment to clean up the Chesapeake Bay. Management strategies for the Bay have been developed. A massive data base has been assembled to define trends in water quality variables and living resources over a 30 year time period for the Bay and its tributaries. There is only the need to establish a mechanism for implementing the Bay management strategies and to monitor their environmental results. I believe my legislation would provide that mechanism and the incentive for the states of Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia to develop and implement an interstate Bay Management Plan.

My legislation will provide a maximum of $10 million in federal funds in each of the next four fiscal years to help the states turn their water pollution reduction plan into action. The federal grant money, to be administered by the EPA, will cover up to 55 percent of the total cost of implementing the plan in each state. Therefore, each state would have to contribute at least 45 percent.

The federal commitment to a healthier Chesapeake Bay must not end merely because the states are now the first line of defense against this water pollution problem. As the country's largest and most productive estuary, the Chesapeake Bay is as much a federal concern as a local one.

My bill also includes a $3 million authorization to insure that the EPA continues to conduct research and monitor changing conditions in the Bay. Special attention would be paid to the effect of pollutant loadings on the dwindling striped bass population.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note today that my bill has received the support of the entire Maryland and Virginia Congressional delegations and over half of the members from Pennsylvania, three of whom are members of this subcommittee. In addition, the governors of Pennsylvania, Maryland and Virginia have all publicly endorsed the bill.

This high level of interest from federal and state officials in the Chesapeake Bay region represents an unprecedent effort to deal with the Bay's problems. We have begun to recognize that there is a mutual interest among the needs of all parties in the region. Residents on the Bay worry about non-point source pollution harming the aquatic life. Farmers who live near the Bay or in the Susquehanna Valley are concerned with finding ways to save money on fertilizer and improving their productivity by preventing further soil erosion. Problems such as these have too often been seen as being mutually exclusive and therefore incapable of a comprehensive solution. My bill initiates the kind of coordinated approach that begins the process of dealing with runoff and its harmful effect not only on the Chesapeake Bay, but on our farmland.

Finally, my legislation would provide $1.5 million in each of five fiscal years for the EPA to conduct research assessing the principal factors having an adverse effect on the environmental quality of the Narragansett Bay in Rhode Island. My bill also requires the Administrator of EPA to establish a mechanism for improving the collection, storage, analysis and dissemination of water quality data on the Narragansett Bay.

Mr. Chairman and fellow colleagues, the Clean Water Act is our nation's major legislative vehicle to improve water quality. The Chesapeake Bay, as our nation's largest and most productive estuary, warrants protection under its statutes. My legislation represents an important first step towards improving the Bay's water quality and assuring future generations that the Chesapeake Bay will continue to be a productive center for economic development and aquatic life. I urge its inclusion in this year's reauthorization of the Clean Water Act. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would gladly answer any questions you may have.●

MUCH MORE THAN COVERT AID

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article from yesterday's Washington Times by M. Stanton Evans.

Mr. Evans clarifies the real moral issue involved in Boland-Zablocki: Not whether it is immoral to provide covert aid to insurgents fighting to overthrow a foreign government, but whether it is immoral not to give any aid—overt or covert—to persons defending their freedom against oppression by the Sandinista regime.

This aid cutoff is dangerous as it grants the Soviets and Cubans a privileged sanctuary on the American mainland, abrogates the Monroe Doctrine and, in effect, enforces the Brezhnev doctrine.

[From the Washington Times, Aug. 3, 1983]

(By M. Stanton Evans)

MUCH MORE THAN COVERT AID

The truly incredible nature of what the House of Representatives has voted concerning U.S. policy toward Nicaragua doesn't come through in most discussions of this topic.

What the public is being told is that "covert" or "secret" aid to the anti-communist rebels in Nicaragua would be suspended by the House amendment. This is made to sound like a vote for openness and honesty—to stop pretending we aren't doing something that everybody knows we are, as befits a democratic nation.

If that were in fact what the House had done, the vote would have something to recommend it. Since everybody knows by now that we have been helping the anticommunists in Nicaragua, it makaes us look both foolish and dishonest to act as if we aren't. Granted the need and desirability of covert action in certain cases, no good purpose is served by clinging to such a fig leaf here.

Moreover, a pretty good case can be made for overt assistance to the Nicaraguan "Contras." It is now established fact that the Sandinista government is a funnel for Soviet and Cuban arms and the proximate source of aggression against El Salvador and other nations in the region. That being so, our government should state that we're going to take whatever steps are needed to get such aggression halted—up to and including arms aid to the Contras. That's a perfectly sensible position, and there are plenty of data on the public record to support it.

Unfortunately, what the House has voted is nothing like this. Rather than requiring that aid to the Contras be open and above

board, it has voted that such aid be cut off entirely, with no ifs, ands or buts. The amendment it adopted requires that no official funds be disbursed if the outlay would have "the effect of supporting, directly or indirectly, military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua, by any nation, group, organization, movement, or individual."

The so-called "open" assistance authorized by this amendment would be aid to governments in the region—not the Contras. And, to make sure that no arms aid whatever could get through to the Nicaraguan anti-communists, the amendment further specifies that this assistance can't be transferred to any group that is trying to overthrow the Sandinistas. In other words, by adopting this amendment, the House was not voting against secrecy. It was voting against extending any aid whatever to anticommunist guerrillas opposing the Sandinistas.

What makes this the more remarkable is that the House Intelligence Committee, which devised and reported this amendment, has itself emphasized the crucial role of the Sandinistas in exporting revolution to El Salvador, and the flow of Cuban-Soviet aid into the region through Managua. Its findings in this respect, for instance, include the following:

"There is . . . persuasive evidence that the Sandinista government of Nicaragua is helping train insurgents and is transferring arms and financial support from and through Nicaragua to the insurgents. They are further providing the insurgents bases of operation in Nicaragua. Cuban involvement in Nicaragua—especially in providing arms—is also evident . . .

"A major portion of the arms and other material sent by Cuba and other communist countries to the Salvadoran insurgents transits Nicaragua with the permission and assistance of the Sandinistas. The Salvadoran insurgents rely on the use of sites in Nicaragua, some of which are located in Managua itself, for communications, command-and-control, and for the logistics to conduct their financial, material and propaganda activities.

"The Sandinista leadership sanctions and directly facilitates all of the above functions. Nicaragua provides a range of other support activities, including secure transit of insurgents to and from Cuba, and assistance to the insurgents in planning their activities in El Salvador. In addition, Nicaragua and Cuba have provided—and appear to continue providing—training to the Salvadoran insurgents."

Having made those findings, the committee then went on to recommend a total cutoff of aid to anticommunist Nicaraguans fighting against the Sandinistas. The House has followed suit, along the way negating a proposal that would have hinged this move to a cessation of arms aid by the Sandinistas to the Marxists in El Salvador. If the Senate concurs, the net effect would be to ensure the Soviets and Cubans a priviledged sanctuary on the American mainland—courtesy of the U.S. Congress. Rather different, wouldn't you say, from simply voting in favor of openness and honesty?●

WOMEN EXPLOITED BY ABORTION (WEBA) FIGHT ABORTIONS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, of the 1.5 million abortions performed each year in the United States, it is estimated that over 150,000 second and third trimester babies are legally terminated. According to the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, approximately 500 babies actually survive the "procedure" and go on to be adopted. Thousands more survive momentarily, but receive no treatment whatsoever. Clearly, the unborn child is a pathetic victim whose right to live is predicated solely on whether or not he or she is wanted.

But it is becoming increasingly clear that they are not the only victims.

As Nancyjo Mann, founder of Women Exploited By Abortion (WEBA) points out in today's Washington Times, the women who abort are also victims.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Mann should know. She had a saline abortion when her baby was 5½ months gestation. She gave birth to a dead baby girl poisoned by the salt. She has been through hell trying to deal with what she permitted a doctor to do to her baby. She feels she has been ripped off by the abortionist who trivialized the nature of the deed and conned by a legal system that stretches "freedom of choice" to include the painful destruction of children. She named her baby girl Shauna Marie.

In today's article she says:

Once they put the saline in there's no way to reverse it. And for the next hour and a half I felt my daughter thrash around violently while she was being choked, poisoned, burned, and suffocated to death. I didn't know any of that was going to happen. And I remember talking to her and I remember telling her I didn't want to do this, I wished she could live.

Less than 1 year ago, Ms. Mann founded WEBA. Its 10,000 members all had abortions and are eager—despite the personal pain involved in going public—to get the message out that abortion exploits women. Two weeks ago, I met Ms. Mann. Articulate and sincere, I was impressed with her determination to make Americans—especially Congress—face the grim reality about abortion. I was particularly impressed with her compassionate concern for the women, the unsung victims of abortion.

I commend the article to you for your reading.

[From The Washington Times, Wednesday, Aug. 3, 1983]

WOMEN FORM WEBA TO FIGHT ABORTIONS

(By Tom Diaz)

NANCY JO MANN ON THE HORROR OF HAVING AN ABORTION AND OF THE MISSION OF WOMEN EXPLOITED BY ABORTION

Q: Tell us about your experience with abortion and its consequences.

A: My experience goes back to 1974, the month of October, 30th day—the day that I killed by baby girl. It was a second trimester abortion. I was 5½ months pregnant.

I went to the doctor because family members had pressured me, had encouraged me. There was no "Nancy maybe you should reconsider," because it was not my idea in the first place, it was theirs.

My husband had walked out the door and deserted us. The responsibility of three children was just too much for him. I went to my mother and my brother and asked, "What am I going to do?" And my mother said "It's obvious, Nancy, no man's going to want you with three children, let alone the two you already have. You're probably not going to amount to a hill of beans and you're probably going to be on welfare the rest of your life."

And following those three positive, uplifting statements, she said "You're going to have an abortion." Then she called one of the leading ob/gyns in the Midwest, and he said, "Absolutely, no problem. Bring her on in."

Q: Did he know at the time how far you were along?

A: Absolutely. He does all kinds of second trimesters, no problem.

I went in and I asked, "What are you going to do to me?" All he did was look at my stomach and say, "I'm going to take a little fluid out, put a little fluid in, you'll have severe cramps and expel the fetus."

I said, "Is that all?" He said, "That's all."

It didn't sound too bad. But what that doctor described to me was not the truth.

I went to the hospital and 60 ccs of amniotic fluid were drawn out, and a saline solution injected. Immediately the needle went through the abdomen. I hated Nancyjo, I hated myself. With every ounce of my being I wanted to scream out "Please, stop, don't do this to me." But I couldn't get it out.

Once they put in the saline there's no way to reverse it. And for the next hour and a half I felt my daughter thrash around violently while she was being choked, poisoned, burned and suffocated to death. I didn't know any of that was going to happen. And I remember talking to her and I remember telling her I didn't want to do this, I wished she could live. And yet she was dying and I remember her very last kick on her left side. She had no strength left.

I've tried to imagine us dying that kind of death, a pillow put over us, suffocating. In four minutes we'd pass out. We'd have that gift of passing out and then dying. But it took her an hour and a half just to die.

Then I was given an intravenuous injection to help stimulate labor and I went into hard labor for 12 hours. And at 5:30 a.m. on the 31st of October I delivered my daughter whose name is now Charmaine Marie. She was 14 inches long. She weighed over a pound and a half. She had a head of hair and her eyes were opening.

I got to hold her because the nurses didn't make it to the room in time. I delivered my girl myself. They grabbed her out of my hands and threw her, threw her, into a bedpan. After they finished and took her

away in the bedpan, they brought a lady in to finish her last hour of labor lying next to me. She had a healthy baby boy.

That was tough.

I liked Nancyjo, I liked me. prior to the abortion. But shame and remorse and guilt set in—I mean, when you get a hold of your own daughter and you see what you did. She was not a "fetus." She was not a "product of conception." She was not a "tissue adhering to the uterine wall." She was my daughter and I got to hold her, at only 5½ months, 22 weeks. So those are cheap, inhuman words to use around me.

I chose to be sterilized because I couldn't cope with the idea that I could possibly kill again. It was too devastating. It was not something you go around telling people, that you just killed your baby, no problem. I was ashamed, totally ashamed.

Q: But some people would say that although this experience obviously had a great impact on you, it is not characteristic of most other women who have abortions. Is your case unusual?

A: No, my case is not unusual at all. People want to say "Oh, but Nancy, you're the extreme." That's not true. In fact there are so many more of us than there are the other. The emotional hurt is so deep. You do not discuss your abortion, the suction machines and the needles and everything else, over a cup of tea and a cookie. Women just don't do this. The pain is just too deep and too great.

I'm sure there are women out there who are never fazed, never, by their abortion. But I would say that 98, 99 percent of them are fazed, whether it's for a small period of time or for the rest of their life, whether they suffer only a small degree or die from their abortions.

Q: How did WEBA—Women Exploited By Abortion—get started?

A: About one year ago I was talking to another recording artist who was pro-life. I asked what pro-life meant and he said he was anti-abortion. I said, "Hank, I had an abortion in 1974. I was 5½ months pregnant. It hurt so bad for so long."

He just about drove the car off the road. And he said, "Nancy, you've got to tell the story." So, a year ago I went public, founded WEBA.

Q: How many members do you have?

A: I'm a 10-month-old corporation and in 10 months I've gone from being two people, my vice president and myself, in two states, Virginia and Iowa, to now having 34 states with approximately 10,000 women in my group.

Q: What are some of the effects of abortion on women?

A: I have women who cannot vacuum their carpets. They have to have the neighbor or their husbands do it while they're at the grocery store, because of the suction sound. You see, the suction machine (used in many abortions) makes that sucking sound—it's 29 times more powerful than the vacuum we use in our home. The majority of the women aren't put to sleep. It's done without being put to sleep. It's heartbreaking to me that they can't run a vacuum cleaner—that's a deep wound.

One psychological effect we see almost all the time is guilt. Others are suicidal impulses, a sense of loss, of unfulfillment. Mourning, regret and remorse. Withdrawal, loss of confidence in decision-making capabilities. They feel that maybe they've made a wrong decision, maybe they can't make another decision right in their life. Lowering of self esteem. Preoccupation with death. Hostilities, self-destructive behavior, anger and rage. You can lose your temper quickly. A despair, helplessness, desire to remember the death date which is really weird but you do that. You remember the death date which is really weird but you do that. You remember these dates very strongly. A preoccupation with the would-be due date or due month. My daughter was due in early March, so in early March it's there.

An intent interest in babies but a thwarted maternal instinct. Women really are interested in babies, but I have many members who can't hold children. A hatred for anyone connected with abortion. Lack of desire to enter into a relationship with a partner, loss of interest in sex, and inability to forgive self, feeling of dehumanization, nightmares, seizures and tremors, frustrations, feelings of being exploited. And child abuse. We see a lot of child abuse.

I want you to understand that I do not come from any right to life organization. We are connected with no one. We remain neutral. But we are the ones they are all arguing about and discussing and debating. We are the voice of experience.

I told Congressman (Henry A.) Waxman, D-Cal., at a recent hearing,"Have you ever had your cervix dilated and the womb ripped open? Have you ever had tubes stuck inside of you and everything sucked out? Have you ever had needles stuck through your abdomen? Have you ever felt your baby thrash around and die? Have you ever had hard labor, delivered and held your baby? Because if you haven't, sir, you can't intelligently talk to me about this. We are the voice of experience. We've all had this done to us."

And that's a fact. So we hold our own ground, our own turf, our own territory.

Q: What is it that your organization does as a voice of experience?

A: We are a support group for those women who hurt—physically, emotionally, mentally and spiritually—from their abortions. We are there when the phone rings at 3 in the morning and someone is suicidal because maybe it was four years ago on that day and they still can't cope with it. We cry with them and talk with them. We are a support group. We also are a political group. I am classified as that, and I guess the strongest thing of what I intend to do—I intend to shut the abortion industry down. I intend to shut the abortion-on-demand industry down.

We also have rape victims and incest victims among our members—the other 3 percent (not abortion-on-demand). And every one of them is getting ready to go public, to speak very publicly—their full names, ages, everything. They're not ashamed. They know what happened to their lives. They became victims of an industry that is making lots of money, that was supposed to be a quick answer.

And now they're under psychiatric care, psychological care. Because of the abortion, not the rape and incest. They overcame the rape and the incest. Sure they needed help, but they overcame that. But they have had a very difficult time overcoming killing that innocent baby.

They heard of WEBA and they contacted us. And two of them were so brutally beaten they couldn't make it to the hospital in time. Pure rapes, I'm not talking about just a strong sexual aggressiveness. I'm talking about women who were brutally beaten, true rape victims.

Q: You talked about political activity. What's been your experience here in the Congress?

A: I testified two weeks ago before Rep. Waxman, Barbara Mikulski and a few other congressmen. It was a stacked hearing—14 to 1 doesn't sound very balanced to me. But I went in very open and honest with them. They sat very intently and very amazed at the story I had to tell about my organization, myself and my constituency, WEBA.

Barbara Mikulski said "I've never heard this side." I said, "No, Pandora's box got opened up 10 years ago and now you're just starting to see it." I predict that in five years we will see an epidemic of mental and nervous breakdowns among the women of this country. People are not going to know why and I'm going to be able to tell you why: because they've had an abortion, that's why.

It's a quick solution. Abortion is not an ending of problems, it's the down payment for a whole new set of problems. That's what it is. It doesn't get rid of them.

Q: Have congressmen been exposed to your view, the voice of experience?

A: No. I hear time and time again, "I've never heard this side before." "Are there many more like you?" they ask. And my answer is this. Take the 15 million of us who have, by legal abortion-on-demand, killed our babies. I will give 2 million or 3 million to Planned Parenthood, NOW or whoever they want. I will give another 2 million or 3 million who have two or three abortions without open remorse.

And justification to oneself is important here, by the way. I don't know how many women I told to go have abortions. Justification. It's like, if you can have a few more, go do what you did and kind of justify it, it makes it better. It makes it not quite so bad.

That still leaves 9 million of us who've been hurt in one way, shape or form or the other—psychologically, physically, emotionally or spiritually.

Q: So you believe that there are—by conservative estimate—perhaps 10 million women who suffered as you did?

A: I believe by very conservative there's 8 million who have been hurt.

Q: Where can they write or call? Or what can they do if they need somebody, such as your organization?

A: They can call or they can write. The address is WEBA, 1553 24th St., Des Moines, Iowa 50311. Or they can reach me at 515-255-0552, my business phone. If they hurt, if they're at a certain state, I may have a state representative where a girl can be with them and talk with them. I get so many women who have written me to say, "Thank God, there is somebody that I can now finally pour the whole thing out to."

And I'm thankful that I am a Christian because I couldn't carry that load. If you could read my mail . . . It started off where I'd get two and three letters a day and now they're wrapping it in bundles to bring to me. And I get mail from all over the world.

Q: Within 10 months this has happened?

A: In 10 months. There is such a need. No one thought 10 years ago of the aftermath. We're the aftermath.●

PARK SERVICE EMPLOYEES, ED JOHN, CLETUS YOUNKER, AND JOE SMITH CITED FOR BRAVERY

HON. BEVERLY B. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, the recent heroic efforts of three National Park Service employees have come to my attention and I am proud to share the happy results of this event with my colleagues.

The actions of Ranger Ed John, maintenance worker Cletus Younker, and maintenance foreman Joe Smith provides an example of good citizenship for those of us in Government and for all the American people. The brave deeds of the two maintenance workers who scaled a rock cliff with ropes to rescue Boy Scout Edward Hopkins, with no thought as to their own safety, are especially important to note.

We should recognize them and be inspired by their actions to extend a helping hand to another who needed assistance in a time of trouble. I am pleased that these courageous National Park Service employees are my constituents who are deserving of special commendation.

At this point, I include the article from the August 4, 1983, Washington Post which highlights their action.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 4, 1983]

U.S. PARK EMPLOYES RESCUE BOY SCOUT

OLDTOWN, MD., August 3.—Two national park employes in Western Maryland rescued a Delaware Boy Scout today who was stranded on a cliff, officials said.

U.S. Park Service Ranger Ed John said Edward Hopkins, 15, of Wilmington, climbed about 75 feet up a shale cliff at the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park in Allegany County at about 10 a.m.

Park maintenance workers rappelled from the top of the cliff and lowered the Wilmington youth to safety. John said the scout was not injured.●

WILLIAM BELL

HON. TIM VALENTINE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thurday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Durham County, N.C. commissioners, William Bell has taken decisive and effective action to make local government more responsive to the needs of its citizens. I salute Mr. Bell for his outstanding achievements, and request that a recent article in the Raleigh News & Observer describing his life of challenge and struggle for opportunity be inserted in the RECORD:

ACTION REPLACES TALK FOR DURHAM COMMISSIONER

(By David Brown)

DURHAM.—In a county where 36 percent of the residents are black, dominated by a city whose population is almost half black, making government meetings accessible to working people and ensuring open hiring for government jobs are not small issues.

Yet for years, many felt that Durham County commissioners gave little more than lip service to those goals. With the election of the new chairman of the board last December, talk turned to action. By January the board had switched its meeting time from mornings to evenings, and in April it adopted an affirmative action plan for county government hiring.

The changes probably resulted as much from a major shift in the political leanings of the five-member board as from the influence of the new chairman, but to William Vaughn Bell, the means don't matter as much as the end.

His election as the board's first black chairman followed 10 years during which some said Bell was beating his head against a wall. He prefers to believe he was slowly building on a base he started when he joined the board just four years after coming to Durham, biding his time until the political climate warmed to his concerns for issues like growth and the problems of the disadvantaged.

"The feeling I got was that if an idea didn't come from the majority of the board, we weren't going to deal with it—it wasn't worth doing," said Bell, recalling years when he was not a member of that majority. "There's no question in my mind that being there makes a difference, even if you can't get things done.

"Even though you were not able to get done what you wanted to, you were there, and you could express the concerns of these people."

For Bell, it seems, "being there" has given way to "arrived."

At only 42, while juggling his job as an IBM executive, his leadership of a plastic molding company and his involvement in a non-profit community development corporation, he has some people encouraging him to climb higher in politics.

During a childhood divided between Washington and Winston-Salem, Bell learned a bit about the inner workings of the private and the public sectors, and the not-so-subtle differences between drinking fountains.

He left Washington at age 5 to live with his grandparents in Winston-Salem, but continued to spend summers at his mother's home near Howard University, visiting "every government building there was to visit."

In North Carolina, he saw the business world through the eyes of his grandfather, a messenger for Wachovia Bank and Trust Co. who also owned rental properties, and through an uncle who taught school.

Bell couldn't understand why the uncle shined shoes in hotel barber shops in the summer, until he found out it was a front—he was eavesdropping on businessmen for tips on how to invest what money he had.

"I was always impressed by any black businessmen I saw in the community," Bell said.

At the age of 6 or 7, he was independent enough to leave the church his grandparents attended, having found one he liked better.

Bell asserted his independence in other ways, some of which his Southern peers didn't understand.

"I would always refuse to drink at a fountain that was marked 'Colored'," he said. Summers in Washington, where racial separatism was not as pronounced, had left him feeling "I shouldn't be treated that way," he said.

"I could never understand the great disparity between what blacks had and what whites had in Winston-Salem."

Bell returned to Washington to study electrical engineering at Howard, and later got a master's degree while designing computers as a civilian working for the Army.

Though dismayed at the racial attitudes in Winston-Salem and in Florida while working there briefly, he also had noticed something positive about the behavior of blacks in the South. During his graduate school years in New Jersey, he was surprised at the number of students who left high school without career plans. In North Carolina, he said, there was an assumption that you were going to college or into the military.

"I didn't see the so-called role models for blacks in New Jersey that I saw in the South," Bell said. "I knew eventually I'd come back South. I could see things were changing."

Fate may have thrown him into politics when he reported to IBM in the Research Triangle Park in 1968.

While waiting for their house to be built, Bell and his family lived with another IBMer, Eugene Hampton, who was in the middle of a campaign for Durhan City Council. Hampton lost the election, but Bell gained his first exposure to campaign work.

Later Bell took the lead in a community organization's zoning fight with the county commissioners. Again, his side lost, but again, being there had helped. "I think we impressed the developers with our concerns," Bill said.

What impressed him was the amount of politics involved in getting things done.

The groundwork for black participation on the board of commissioners had been laid by Asa T. Spaulding, the former president of N.C. Mutual Life Insurance Co., the nation's largest black-owned financial institution.

In 1972, when Spaulding decided not to seek re-election as a commissioner, his political organization got behind Bell.

The early years, in the company of a well-established conservative majority on the board, were "frustrating in the sense that I was younger, and had some youthful ideas about how to get things done," Bell said, "I guess I was trying to bring a sensitivity to the board."

He talked to deaf ears about affirmative action, about scheduling meetings when working people could attend, about a stronger effort to attract blacks to various boards and committees. He finally told the board in 1981, "I don't like to bring up the racial bit (but) based on the way we're doing things, it looks like no changes in attitude."

Bell also was nagged by a feeling that Durham had missed the boat on residential and commercial development outside the Research Triangle Park. As Raleigh and Cary grew rapidly, he said, the absence of a clear water and sewer extension policy hindered Durham's growth.

He pressed for using revenue sharing money and for a bond referendum to spread water and sewer lines, to no avail against

other board members who thought the cost was too high.

The 1974 election of Spaulding's wife, Elna, did little to change the political makeup of the board. The breakthrough for her and for Bell came last fall with the election of a progressive Democrat, Rebecca Heron.

In addition to the affirmative action plan, the beginning of night meetings and an open nominations process for boards and committees, the board under Bell has liberalized water and sewer extension by having interested county residents contribute to the up-front costs.

"I don't think anything the board has done since I've been chairman should come as a surprise to anybody," Bell said. "I've been talking about these things for years.

Bell's chairmanship, Mrs. Spaulding said, "has made the board more coherent and consistent.

"He's an organizer. He knows when things are not working like they should be. He's a sophisticated politician."

A short, slim man, Bell has a way of looking relaxed in a sharp-edged blue suit and IBM spit-and-polish that would make others appear stuffy. But beneath the surface squirms an intense worker.

In his job as technical assistant to the company's manager of technological development, he is responsible for strategies on the technology to be used in new products. And he still finds time to head another company that employs 25 people and to plan a nonprofit corporation's effort to build an industrial park.

Tennis and jogging have mostly given way to the jobs and community work. An occasional getaway to the beach or to his grandparents' house on Badin Lake are about all the non-business traveling he cares to do. The divorced father of two children, Bell remarried in May.

At some point, he says, he probably will have to choose between IBM and politics. But for now, he is just smiling politely at those who say he should go on to state office. At this point state government seems to him too detached from the people it serves, and he is happier being closer to the results of local government decisions.

And he no longer has to be satisfied with just getting others to listen to him talk about the issues that concern him. Now they have to do something about those issues.

FOR THE RECORD—WILLIAM VAUGHN BELL

Born: Jan. 3, 1941, Washington, son of Willie Mae Mullen of Winston-Salem and William B. Bell of Burgaw.

Education: graduated from Atkins High School, Winston-Salem; undergraduate degree in electrical engineering, Howard University; master's degree in electrical engineering, New York University.

Family: wife Judith, two children by a previous marriage.

Honors: 1980 Community Involvement of the Year Award by the N.C. Human Relations Council.●

BROADCAST REFORM LEGISLATION

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Consumer Protection and Finance is conducting hearings on broadcast reform legislation. This afternoon's hearing will focus on the issue of assuring responsiveness by broadcasters to a local community's needs.

Since the Communications Act of 1934 was enacted, the comparative renewal process has served as the primary mechanism through which a broadcaster's license could be challenged in order to provide a measure of accountability to better insure broadcaster responsiveness to community needs and interests.

Before this Congress acts to abolish or substantially modify the comparative renewal process, careful consideration should be given to situations such as the one involving radio station KTTL-FM of Dodge City, Kans.

I commend the following article to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, May 18, 1983]

KANSANS PROTEST BROADCASTS OF HATE

(By Wayne King)

DODGE CITY, KAN., May 13—Nellie Babbs, a blunt-speaking woman, and her husband, Charlie, believe they are God's watchmen, keepers of a "trumpet of warning" that was given them to sound when they see "the enemy coming."

The trumpet, as the Babbses see things, is their little country music radio station, KTTL-FM. Some law-enforcement officials would like to silence that warning trumpet, and the Federal Communications Commission is debating the point.

The "enemies" about whom the station has sounded the alarm, in twice-nightly tape-recorded broadcasts throughout last fall and into February, are legion: blacks, Roman Catholics, Asians, public officials, the courts, the Internal Revenue Service and, particularly, Jews, which KTTL broadcasts have described as "the children of Satan" who "are going to go, at 2 and 3 and 4 in the morning, one way or another."

The station has suggested that listeners learn guerrilla warfare techniques, including garroting people in their sleep with lengths of rawhide; hanging public officials, "cleansing the earth" of "black beasts" and setting up roadblocks for ambushes for an impending racial Armageddon it says is sure to come.

A LINK TO PARAMILITARY GROUP

The broadcasts were prepared by two men described as paramilitary evangelists associated with an extremist vigilante group called Posse Comitatus, which has conducted guerrilla warfare training sessions in Kansas and in other parts of the country. Among those who have identified themselves as followers of Posse Comitatus is Gordon Kahl, a tax protester who has been indicated in connection with the killing of two Federal marshals Feb. 16 in North Dakota.

The call to violence in the broadcasts has sent a shock wave though this historic frontier town of 18.000 people, haunted through it is by the sixgun shades of Bat Masterson, Wyatt Earp and the tenants of Boot Hill.

KTTL, the only country music station within a 60-mile radius, broadcasts to a listening area in which fewer than 400 blacks and only a handful of Jewish families live. Its Hispanic listeners were among the first to complain. The broadcasts also drew fire from Senator Bob Dole, a Kansas Republican, the State Attorney General, Robert Stephan, and from other law-enforcement officials around the state.

DOLE SEEKS F.C.C. REVIEW

In a letter to the Federal Communications Commission, Senator Dole last Wednesday expressed his shock at "vicious racist remarks" and "terroristic threats" aired by the station. He urged "an immediate and thorough look to determine is the station's "intimidating racist programming can withstand the test of F.C.C. law."

The broadcasts have already generated a critical case for the commission. The station's license is up for renewal next month, and three area residents have filed a petition, orginated by a Washington-based public interest group called the National Black Media Coalition, to deny the license.

Another group in Dodge City, calling itself Community Service Broadcasting Inc., has asked the commission to the reassign the KTTL frequency to it, proposing extensive public interest programming.

The communications commission is not expected to take action on either petition for several months, probably extending the license on an interim basis until a bearing can be held.

A DIFFICULT CHORE SEEN

Despite the inflammatory nature the "sermons," the F.C.C. and communications lawyers say that taking away the Babbses license will be difficult.

Citing constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and past challenges to other stations, Mark Solberg, the commission lawyer in charge of investigating the case, said those seeking the revocation had "a tough row to hoe."

The consensus among communications lawyers is that in the absence of a showing of obscenity, or a direct connection of the broadcasts to an actual act of violence, the F.C.C. will be powerless to act.

Instances of license revocations have been rare.

In 1972, when J. B. Stoner, a professed "white racist" candidate for the United States Senate from Georgia, attempted to get radio and television stations to air commercials saying that a vote for him was "a vote against the niggers," two stations refused the ads.

AGENCY RULED FOR CANDIDATE

The F.C.C., however, ruled that the stations had to accept the advertising.

"However abhorrent some speech might be," the commission said, "there was in this case no evidence of a clear and present danger of imminent violence which might warrant interfering with speech which does not contain any direct incitement of violence."

Three years earlier, however, after the commission refused to act on its own, Warren E. Burger, then a judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, ruled that a Jackson, Miss., station, WLBT, had "violated its

public trust" by interjecting racial discrimination into its programming.

In that case, however, it was not the content of programs that was at issue, but rather such acts as the dropping of a "Bonanza" show featuring a black, and the premature cutting away from a network report showing whites attacking blacks.

The Babbses began broadcasting the tapes last June, after a visit by William P. Gale and James P. Wickstrom, the Posse Comitatus evangelists, who spoke at a meeting of area farmers and later supplied the station with tape recordings. A James Wickstrom has been identified as national director for counterinsurgency for Posse Comitatus. The Babbses say they broadcast the tapes for a fee paid by Mr. Gale's identity Church and donors they decline to name.

The station, which broadcasts automatically front pre-programmed tapes around the clock, discontinued the Gale-Wickstrom broadcasts in February, but Mrs. Babbs says she did so only because she ran out of recorded messages.

However, opposition to the broadcasts coalesced in late January after a competing Dodge City radio station, KGNO, began airing editorials urging citizens to petition the F.C.C. to deny KTTL renewal of its license.

COMPLAINTS FROM LISTENERS

Robert Kirby, the general manager of KGNO, said he first monitored KTTL on Jan. 21, after receiving a number of complaints from his own listeners. The program he heard was titled "Victory with Jesus," by Mr. Gale. Some excerpts from it, from a tape recording provided by Mrs. Babbs, are as follows:

"Yes, we're gonna cleanse our land. We're gonna do it with a sword. And we gonna do it with violence. 'Oh,' they say, 'Reverend Gale, you're teaching violence.' You're damn right I'm teaching violence! God said you're gonna do it that way, and it's about time somebody is telling you to get violent, whitey."

And it continued: "You better start making dossiers, names, addresses, phone numbers, car license numbers, on every damn Jew rabbi in this land, and every Anti-Defamation League leader or J.D.L. leader in this land, and you better start doing it now. And know where he is. If you have to be told any more than that, you're too damn dumb to bother with. You get these roadblock locations, where you can set up ambushes, and get it all working now."

Excerpts from other broadcasts by Mr. Gale and Mr. Wickstrom that were filed with the petition to the F.C.C. in Washington, or collected by the office of Attorney General Stephan, are replete with similar statements.

The Babbses maintain the quotations are "taken out of context."

Mr. and Mrs. Babb, in taking a stance common among Posse Comitatus adherents, have refused to pay their property taxes, and the station's receipts have been attached by the state.●

EXCHANGING LAND IN HAWAII

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Government Operations has oversight of the disposal and Federal surplus property. It has assigned that duty to the Government Activities and Transportation Subcommittee. As chairwoman of that subcommittee, I wish to inform the House of a strange provision which the Senate Appropriations Committee has reported as an amendment to H.R. 3363, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill, 1984. Section 318 of the reported bill is a special relief measure for three private property owners on the main island of Hawaii. They own a total of over 640 very valuable acres in an area which section 505 of Public Law 95-625 designated for National Park Service acquisition as the Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park.

Section 318 of H.R. 3363 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to seek to acquire these acres by using, in effect, the General Services Administration's surplus property as the means of payment. After negotiating an agreement with the landowners, on the basis of appraised values. The Secretrary would issue dollar credits to the landowners instead of paying them cash. The landowners, or persons to whom they sold the credits, would then use the credits, like scrip, to pay for any surplus property anywhere in the United States that GSA has put up for competitive sale.

The landowners complain that because their property is in a designated park area and because the National Park Service has no present plan to buy the property, they cannot sell it for anything like true value. Three years ago, a special legislative provision was enacted in the Treasury-GSA Appropriations Act (Public Law 96-514) designed to aid these same landowners by permitting them to exchange their lands for Federal surplus lands of equivalent value. As GSA construed it, however, the provision was applicable only to surplus property in Hawaii.

This provision, if enacted, would cost the budget millions of dollars, not appropriated dollars, of course, but revenue dollars already budgeted as proceeds of surplus property sales. This provision, if enacted, would lead to acquiring, at the expense of budget receipts land for an additional national park when the administration and the Congress have severely limited funds for such acquisitions.

We are talking about property of extremely high value. At one time, there were estimates that the total value of the three parcels exceeded $60,000,000.

The Committee on Government Operations will be trying to get a fuller explanation of the circumstances of this case. I would be interested to learn the answers to several questions: Why this administration has seen fit to support here a truly major exception to its present land-sales-for-cash policy. Why these landowners' situation is unique and worthy above any other involving landowners in similar circumstances. Why those who support this provision have no apparent qualms about creating a difficult precedent that would have to be explained to other private landowners in similar predicaments. Why the Interior Department does not propose use of moneys in the land and water conservation fund for purchase of these lands. Why effort to apply the existing statutory provision is not employed that apparently authorizes exchanging these lands for Federal surplus lands in Hawaii. And I would be interested to learn more about the extensive and intensive lobbying that appears to have marked this case for so long.

Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt that this case may involve hardships for the private landowners concerned. I should like to understand, however, the justification for such a departure by our Government from evenhandedness in providing relief to all worthy claimants for similar relief.

I hope all Members will want to have such explanations before there is any House consideration of this provision.●

STENHOLM-STANGELAND BILL TO REFORM THE DAVIS-BACON ACT

HON. CHARLES W. STENHOLM

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, at a time of $200 billion deficits and intolerably high unemployment, it is increasingly unjustifiable and unfair to continue ignoring meaningful steps Congress can take to address these and other serious economic problems. One significant, yet obvious and relatively simple, way to save billions of taxpayers' dollars, create thousands of new jobs, increase the competitiveness of small businesses, and spur a stronger economic recovery, is to reform the Davis-Bacon Act.

With this in mind, Congressman STANGELAND and I are today introducing legislation to amend the Davis-Bacon Act and related statutes. Our bill will provide new job opportunities, effect significant cost savings on Federal construction contracts, promote small business participation in Federal contracting, and reduce unnecessary paperwork and reporting requirements.

There is a crying need for such reform. The Washington Post, New York Times, Chicago Tribune, Miami Herald, Portland Oregonian, and Albuquerque Journal are only a few of the

dozens of newspapers and magazines that have criticized the act, calling it, among other things, an albatross and bad law.

It is widely estimated that paying Davis-Bacon wages, rather than market wages, inflates the costs of Federal construction contracts by $1 billion or more a year. Overall, application of Davis-Bacon needlessly increases costs by 5 to 15 percent—GAO estimate—according to an extensive study conducted by Oregon State University, the disparity between Davis-Bacon and market wages is still greater in rural areas. Therefore, a law that was meant to guarantee that wages on Federal projects would reflect local prevailing wages, instead, guarantees that the taxpayers will pay the highest wages. To make matters worse, these artificially higher rates then spread from Government to private construction, fostering an escalating superminimum wage rate for the industry; both rates, in turn, become the basis for the next round of Davis-Bacon rates. The total inflationary ripple effect on the rest of the economy has been estimated to be as high as $20 billion a year.

Another problem arises because rural areas often have wage bases and worker classifications that bear little resemblance to those of nearby urban areas; yet they are frequently lumped together to determine a prevailing wage. In general, because they tend to be more labor-intensive, small businesses and rural contractors have been forced, under the Davis-Bacon Act, into articificially uncompetitive, disadvantageous positions vis-a-vis large contractors.

In its present form, as historically applied by the Secretary of Labor, Davis-Bacon prevents creation of new jobs—100,000 or more every year. Because the act spreads around any given number of Federal dollars to too few workers, and because it has seldom allowed for entry-level helper classifications, the prime victims of Davis-Bacon become obvious: Women, minorities, and younger job-seekers; the less skilled, marginally employable, and structurally or hard core unemployed. In short, precisely those disadvantaged persons in our labor market who need help the most.

Because of these problems, and others, we are introducing a bipartisan bill to clarify and improve the Davis-Bacon Act. This will be reform, not repeal, legislation. The Davis-Bacon Act was passed in 1931, in response to the Great Depression. Some of its purposes were and are valid and we seek to reaffirm these, while making the act more cost effective in today's world. Along these lines, Congressman STANGELAND and I have been working for the past several months to fashion legislation which, we are confident, is the fairest possible to the American worker, small businesses, and the average taxpayer.

Briefly, the legislation we are introducing would accomplish the following:

First, the threshold contract amount that triggers application of the Davis-Bacon provisions would be increased from $2,000, an amount unchanged since 1935, to $1 million; this would encourage much greater participation by small business in Federal construction projects. Small businesses, especially, have been discouraged from bidding on and entering into such Federal contracts because of the costs added by Davis-Bacon.

Second, locally prevailing wages will be determined according to the particular urban or rural subdivision of the State in which the work is to be performed.

Third, rather than leaving it up to the Secretary of Labor or, as is now occurring, the courts, this bill would clarify the definition of prevailing wage as the entire range of wages paid to the corresponding class of workers in a given area. This will more accurately and more economically reflect true local prevailing wages, rather than continue the often-used practice of basing this figure on the 30 percent of the class of workers with the highest wages.

Fourth, wage data of Federal projects would be excluded from calculations of locally prevailing wages. This preserves and better carries out the original intention of the Davis-Bacon Act, by allowing Federal wages to reflect local wages, rather than use one round of wages on Federal projects to unrealistically inflate the next round of Federal wages.

Fifth, a separate class of helpers would be recognized. Helpers were never meant to be excluded from the original act, which mentioned only corresponding classes of laborers and mechanics. However, in practice, helpers have been recognized on only a very limited basis, with the result that less-skilled workers are denied opportunities for jobs for which they are qualified and costs are, again, unrealistically inflated.

Sixth, paperwork reporting requirements would be lessened. The Copeland Anti-Kickback Act of 1934 required contractors to furnish weekly statements with respect to wages. Department of Labor regulations have interpreted this by requiring weekly complete payroll records and a "Statement of Compliance." The ensuing deluge of paperwork has hardly been effective as an enforcement tool, and have been an unfair burden especially to small businesses. This bill would require, instead, a statement of compliance with respect to wages to be filed at the beginning and end of the contract period. This makes much greater sense in view of Labor Department reports that effective enforcement comes not from examination of the weekly reports but rather from spot checking carried out by the contracting agencies.

Congressman STANGELAND and I, along with over 75 original cosponsors of this legislation, believe the time has come to improve the provisions and the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act, not through conflicting court decisions and transient administrative regulations, but through clear congressional action.●

RESOLUTION TO PRESERVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a concurrent resolution expressing the House's opposition to the administration's planned reorganization of the Department of Education. In addition, this resolution urges the Secretary of Education to postpone further action on the reorganization plan until the General Accounting Office has determined that the reorganization will not diminish the effectiveness of affected programs.

I am pleased to be joined in this effort by Senators DODD and HOLLINGS, who yesterday introduced identical legislation in the Senate. Senators DODD and HOLLINGS and I have writen the Comptroller General requesting a study of the reorganization proposal.

The administration's plan would consolidate and reduce the personnel levels of a variety of programs designed by Congress to assure equal access to quality education for minorities, the disadvantaged and women. Programs directly affected include: Chapter 1, Compensatory Education; chapter 2, block grants, Indian education, migrant education, the Women's Educational Equity Act program, and title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—Equity Training and Technical Assistance.

In addition, cuts are being proposed in the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, the offices of the Secretary's regional representatives, and in the Office of Student Financial Assistance.

In essence, Mr. Speaker, the administration is attempting to achieve through administrative methods a goal which Congress has repeatedly rejected: the gutting of the Department of Education.

In light of the President's recent campaign on behalf of quality education and in defense of his record on civil rights and women's issues, the planned reorganization is especially

ironic. Indeed, the President's actions provide a more accurate measure of his commitment to equal rights and equal education than his rhetoric.

In the past 18 months, the Department of Education has lost 1,900 employees, comprising over 25 percent of the entire staff. The planned reorganization will add at least 200 more to this number.

More important than the sheer number of employees lost, however, is the loss of expertise that will result from the consolidation of positions, downgrading of job descriptions, and early retirements. Programs of demonstrated effectiveness will be staffed by fewer, less experienced staff.

The resolution I am introducing today addresses the concern for maintaining program effectiveness. Our goal is not to obstruct the Department's managerial discretion, but to establish that the goals intended by Congress in the creation of these programs will not be compromised. It is the obligation of those who propose to reorganize the Department to prove that that action will enhance our educational programs.

I believe it is essential that we determine the potential losses in service delivery and human resources before this plan is put into effect. We cannot condone yet another attempt on the part of the administration to achieve budgetary fixes at the expense of essential civil rights and educational programs.

A copy of the text of the resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 137

Whereas, education is an essential attribute of our democratic society;

Whereas, all students should have access to quality education regardless of their race, national origin, sex, economic background, or handicapped conditions;

Whereas, Congress is committed to furnishing adequate financial and personnel resources to assure access to education;

Whereas, the Congress has established programs of educational assistance to enhance the ability of important segments of our population to reach its full educational potential, including programs for native Americans, children of migrant workers, and disadvantaged children, as well as programs to assure equity of educational opportunity for women and minorities;

Whereas, the programs have a proven record of effectiveness in helping to provide these citizens with realistic opportunities to achieve educational excellence; and

Whereas, current proposals of the Department of Education to reorganize and consolidate programs and to make severe reductions in the personnel necessary to carry out program mandates threaten to undermine their efficient operation and future effectiveness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the current organizational integrity and personnel strength for programs in elementary, secondary, adult, and vocational education in the Department of Education should be retained.

SEC. 2. The House of Representatives urges the Secretary of Education to postpone further action on the reorganization proposals described in the preamble of this resolution until a study by the General Accounting Office determines that the reorganization would not reduce the ability of the Department of Education to achieve the goals intended by Congress when it authorized the affected programs.

SEC. 3. The Clerk of the House of Representatives is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of Education.●

IN MEMORIAM OF HAL STROUBE

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 21, 1983, our city lost a fine and cherished citizen and I lost a most helpful and valued friend, Hal Stroube.

Prior to arriving in Washington, D.C., Hal had an extensive and varying career which, after retiring from the U.S. Army in 1950, included: sports writer/editor assignments throughout Cairo, Ill.; public relations positions with Bechtel Corp. in southern Illinois in 1954; writer/editor for Bechtel Briefs in San Francisco, Calif.; head of public relations with Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (San Francisco) in 1962, during which time he became involved with the siting of Pacific's Diablo Canyon Nuclear Plant; and public relations manager for San Luis Obispo Bay Properties, also in San Francisco. Another major stance before his arrival to Washington was that of consultant to several energy clients, during which time he became well known for his efforts surrounding California's unsuccessful attempts to pass proposition No. 9.

Hal came to Washington in 1972 to work for the Potomac Electric Power Co., as director of communications. He remained with PEPCO until 1977, during which time he became familiar to many of us as PEPCO's spokesman on radio and television. After leaving PEPCO, Hal ventured further in the public relations field as vice president, Washington office director of Underwood, Jordan Associates, a New York-based firm.

It was through his work first with PEPCO and then with Underwood, Jordan that I came to know him and to work with him on many undertakings that aided my office, helped this city, and most especially, helped in the effort that resulted in passage of the full voting rights constitutional amendment, a proposed amendment to the Constitution that would provide representation in the House and the Senate for the citizens of his adopted city. It was his work that helped us reach so many Members whose help we needed. Following passage of the amendment, Hal continued to work with me in seeking out new ideas. I remember his efforts so well and I will always remember his willing helpful hand.

In 1981, he founded and headed his own firm, Hal Stroube Communications, which specialized in coordinating/establishing consumer relations with public utility companies. Hal continued to manage his firm up until his untimely death.

It is extremely hard for me to say goodbye, and especially so to a good friend and associate. He lived an extensive, exciting, and good life. He has left us in body, but his spirit and the memory of his relentless efforts remain. I will miss him. His family will also miss him. I extend my condolences to his lovely wife Rosalie; his daughters Mary K. and Laura; his stepchildren Trey, Todd, and Caprice Taylor; his parents retired Army Colonel and Mrs. E. O. Stroube; a sister Johanna Zubras; his grandchildren and other relatives.●

THE ROAD TO WAR IS PAVED WITH GOOD INTENTIONS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, what peace can be had by baring our military muscle and threatening Nicaragua into calm democratic waters? Warmongering may not be the President's intent, but that is his effect. For all his protestations that he seeks only peace and prosperity for our southern neighbors, Mr. Reagan's military posturing on Central America is leading us every day closer to violent, armed conflict in that region.

I commend an article in the New York Times by John B. Oakes to my colleagues' attention:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 3, 1983]

REAGAN'S PATH TO WAR

(By John B. Oakes)

Unless he is stopped by Congress—and only Congress and the force of public opinion can stop him—Ronald Reagan could plunge this country into the most unwanted, unconscionable, unnecessary and unwinnable war in its history, not excepting Vietnam.

Mr. Reagan sees "the trouble" in Central America as coming "from outside the area," as "revolution exported from the Soviet Union and Cuba." His response is to dispatch huge naval and air armadas to the waters off the Nicaraguan coasts and thousands of American troops to the ranchlands and jungles of neighboring Honduras.

If the revolutionists in Nicaragua and the guerrillas in El Salvador whom they support do not capitulate before this display of American might—as they almost certainly will not—President Reagan has left himself little choice between reversing his Central

America policy and moving in which American guns, planes and men.

Since the premises of Mr. Reagan's policy are wrong, his actions stemming from that policy are wrong. Latin America's revolutions, including Mexico's Cuba's, El Savador's and Nicaragua's, are home-grown, not "exported" from anywhere else. The undoubted Communist influence on these revolutions—always strong and always inevitable—cannot be nullified by external military force, as even Mr. Reagan should have learned from the Bay of Pigs and the events that followed.

These revolutions and revolutionists can be a threat to our security (a minor one at that) only if we force them completely into the Soviet corner and isolate them there. Neither the Russians nor their agents nor their disciples can do as much harm to the long-term interests of the United States as we are doing to ourselves by imitating them in trying to impose our style of democracy on people who may be totally unready or unsuited for it.

Because of the brutal purge of Central American experts as soon as he took office, President Reagan had no one around to tell him that the Sandinista arms buildup in Nicaragua might just possibly not have been impelled by the desire to conquer all the rest of Central America for Castro and Marx. It might have stemmed from genuine fear, founded on history, of direct American military intervention, fantastic as that may have seemed to Mr. Reagan at the time. It doesn't seem so fantastic today—certainly no more fantastic than what he is doing right now to Honduras.

He is remilitarizing this pathetically poor and helpless country just as it is emerging from years of military rule. He is undermining its fragile democracy and indirectly inciting open warfare between Honduras and its neighbors. He is using Honduras not only as a springboard for Nicaraguan "contras" but also as a training ground—on the cheap—for Salvadoran Government troops.

Perhaps no one in the Reagan entourage knew that the last Central American war—a brief but savage one just a few years ago—was between El Salvador and Honduras. The two countries have had a historically unfriendly relationship. The presence of Salvadoran troops on Honduran soil is a prescription for trouble—for which Mr. Reagan again will have to bear the responsibility.

The record in Guatemala is no better. Guerrilla warfare has been smoldering there for at least 20 years. Even less than El Salvador, less than Nicaragua, did Guatemala need Castro or Marx or Communist propaganda to pit rich against poor, oligarchy against peasantry, army against guerrillas. While gross national product has gone up, the living standard of 80 percent of the population has gone down as large-scale agriculture has pushed the Indian peasants into ever less fertile and ever less productive areas in which to grow their own scanty food.

Guatemala's born-again president, who was catapulted into power after a post-election coup last year, may be somewhat less bloodthirsty than his infamous predecessors, but they at least did not have the temerity to claim, as he does, that they were in direct personal contact with the Almighty. Because President Efraín Ríos Montt talks to God and not to Marx, the Reagan Administration can think of nothing better to do with American power and money than to resume the military support that was cut off several years ago because of Guatemala's abominable human rights record. American military supplies have no purpose in Guatemala but continued repression of the Guatemalan people, particularly its large Indian segment.

The growing military involvement of the United States in Nicaragua, Honduras and Guatemala—as well as in El Salvador—may stimulate Mr. Reagan's ego and self-image as "standing up to Communism"; but it is painfully clear that it does nothing to enhance our national security or the welfare of the people of Central America.●

"WHISTLE BLOWING" PROGRAM

HON. GLENN ENGLISH

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, Cliford McKenzie blew the whistles to the tune of $20,000 in abusive acts by fellow Bureau of Indian Affairs workers. But now Mr. McKenzie is only whistling the blues after the BIA superiors said curtains to his act and his job.

Since taking office, President Reagan has repeatedly attacked Federal improprieties. A major arsenal in President Reagan's war against Federal fraud, waste, and abuse entails Federal workers personally reporting irregularities which they discover from within the bureaucracy. The "whistle blowing" program is supposed to afford protection against worker retailiation based upon such reports. The Government, however, apparently did not provide the protection to Cliford McKenzie. After discovering and reporting $20,000 in improper travel pay advances to BIA officers. McKenzie experienced 10 months of professional harassment, culminating with BIA officials firing him from his job.

I do not know how many Mr. McKenzie's there are on the Federal payrolls. But, certainly instances like this would cause most Federal workers to think twice before participating in the "whistle blowing" act. I am submitting for the RECORD the following article highlighting Mr. McKenzie's case.

[From the Tulsa World, July 24, 1983]

GOVERNMENT TATTLETALE FINDS LAW NO BIG HELP

(By Malvina Stephenson)

WASHINGTON.—An Oklahoma Kiowa Indian who tried to be a whistleblower for Uncle Sam and lost his job in the process has now gone to court seeking reinstatement.

Cliford McKenzie has a hardship story to tell which reveals some basic flaws in the whistleblower program—a pet project of Tulsan Joe Wright, chairman of the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency.

McKenzie's frustrating experience would discourage other federal workers—46,000 in Oklahoma—for volunteering in the Reagan Administration's much-touted war on 'waste, fraud and abuse.' McKenzie, a University of Oklahoma accounting graduate, quietly tattled on his supervisors in the Bureau of Indian Affairs for alleged irregularities. Then, he says, the Inspector General of the Interior Department, in violation of the law, tattled on him, and his job performance was downgraded by those he had exposed.

Although McKenzie won a rare "bench decision" at the Denver regional hearing in January 1982, the BIA appealed to the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) which so far has failed to act. All that time, McKenzie has been dangling off the agency payroll, without even a 'thank you' from anybody for his trouble.

Meanwhile, Wright also has been prodding the MSPB for a decision, but so far only uncertainty and confusion for McKenzie. At one point, the MSPB lost his records, and McKenzie suspects the BIA tampered with the replacement they provided.

Now, McKenzie has turned to the federal court to force a decision from the MSPB. He filed a writ of mandamus against the MSPB, charging that he has been denied "due process of law" by the delay and that the MSPB has the "nondiscretionary" duty to rule.

A spokesman for the MSPB says the board has been bogged down with hundreds of cases involving the air traffic controllers, but McKenzie scoffs at this excuse.

"They have been telling me that for over a year," he said.

Under a policy that has been widely criticized, the MSPB does not restore a fired employee to his job after he wins his case at the initial hearing. This is a reversal of the previous policy of the old Civil Service Commission which was succeeded by the new system in 1979.

"It's unforgiveable when you look at the effect it has on individuals' lives," declared Mark D. Roth, acting general counsel of the American Federation of Government Employes. "We have instances where employes marriages were broken up, people forced to move out of their homes, and actually leave their home cities to find other employment, awaiting the final decision."

McKenzie's troubles started in November, 1980, when he reported $20,000 in travel advances to BIA employes accumulated but never used. He also revealed $34 million in missing equipment, some of which his supervisor told him to write off.

The 16 staff members McKenzie reported delinquent in repaying travel expenses were ordered to do so, but apparently not fired. McKenzie's supervisor was demoted one pay grade and transferred to the BIA office in Minneapolis, while McKenzie, himself, was demoted out of his job—for alleged "incompetence" as rated by those he had targeted.

McKenzie won an emphatic victory at the Denver regional hearing. The MSPB attorney-examiner stopped the proceedings midway and ruled that the BIA charges of "incompetence" were so flimsy that his defense need not be presented.

But, under the present policy, McKenzie was not reinstated by this vindication. The BIA appealed to MSPB, keeping him out of his job and leaving him and his family to scrounge the best way they could.

"There are dozens of such cases," declared Roth, the AFGE counsel. "It is very unfair and inefficient. Those finally reemployed will get back pay, while their substitutes were also being paid in their absence. It is a double cost to the government, besides the personal hardships."

McKenzie said they moved back to Oklahoma from Colorado where he had worked

for BIA. He and his wife, with two children, lived with relatives for five months, and he was unemployed for eight of the 18 months he has been trying to get a decision from the MSPB.

After returning to Oklahoma, McKenzie first got a job as administrator for the Kiowa tribe. Now, he has a similar position with the Cheyenne-Arapaho tribe at $33,000 a year, based at El Reno. But he has nearly 13 years invested in his BIA job and he wants it back.

McKenzie's Washington attorney, Barry Trilling, says he has several cases of federal whistleblowers complaining of unfair treatment:

A Vietnam veteran who reported "waste and mismanagement" at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. He was fired just days before he would get permanent status and thus faced even more difficulties than McKenzie. His case is now pending in the U.S. District Court here.

Another appellant discovered "millions of dollars of abuse" in an unidentified agency. The employee brought this to the attention of the General Accounting Office and management corrected what he had cited. But, this worker ended up fighting for his job with an "adverse" performance rating. In a compromise, he went to another agency, and no suit was filed.

In New Jersey, a woman attorney for the U.S. Army reported that colleagues were engaged in private practice on government time. Now, in the face of retaliation, she is charging sex discrimination and violation of her constitutional rights.

Just from his own experience, McKenzie says, "I certainly would not blow the whistle again. It's not worth it. I personally think it is a phony program. The so-called protection (for employees) just does not exist."●

TRIBUTE TO SHALON RALPH

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, again I must undertake a sad task and say goodby to a friend and a gentleman I have come to respect for his efforts in the fight for justice and equality. Shalon Ralph left this life on July 20, 1983, after suffering a heart attack while hospitalized in Bethesda's Suburban Hospital.

A retired Air Force colonel, Shalon was born in Lebanon, Pa., and lived in Chevy Chase, Md., for many years. He attended the University of Pennsylvania and earned both his bachelor's and law degrees there. He served in the Army and Air Force during World War II. After the service, he continued his legal career as an attorney for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission from 1964 to 1971, after which he entered his private practice. Until his retirement in 1982, Shalon specialized in equal-rights issues. Two of the more outstanding cases on which he devoted a vast amount of time and effort included George Foster—where he was successful in obtaining legal fees granted to employees who prevailed in discrimination cases—and Sylvia Gee—in which he succeeded in reversing a policy using time-in-grade policies in opposition to black employees. He also worked with the ethnic employees of the Library of Congress, the black employees of the Library of Congress, for the Senate Special Committee on Aging, and the National Council of Senior Citizens senior aids program. He was also a member of the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights.

My condolences are extended to his entire family: his wife Ruth, daughter Diana, sons Kenneth and Laurence, five brothers, one sister, grandchildren, and other relatives.

A great man has passed. However, his memory will continue because his efforts affected so many lives, including mine.●

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the President announced the establishment of a National Commission on Industrial Competitiveness, and named as its chairman the president of Hewlett-Packard, John Young. Shortly thereafter, on July 18, I brought to the House's attention my concern about whether this newly announced Commission would be a truly effective action-oriented body addressing itself to the formulation of an American response to the challenge of international competition.

I believe such an entity is very much needed in this country right now, and the bill I introduced in March of this year calling for a Bipartisan National Commission on Industrial Competitiveness (H.R. 1896) would create such a body.

I voiced my concern in July—and I continue to voice it—because the President's Commission is apparently going to be neither bipartisan nor sufficiently oriented toward making the type of study and recomendations that I believe our present position in the global competitive picture requires. The mandate of the President's Commission is to produce a report by September 30, 1984, just 1 month before the 1984 Presidential election. I questioned whether the Commission's mandate would lead merely to a campaign tool for the administration.

Apparently my concerns, and my questions, are not mine alone. I want to share with my colleagues an article raising some of these same issues that was written by Stephen Barlas and brought to my attention through a reprint in the San Jose Mercury of July 22, 1983. The text of the article follows:

[From the San Jose Mercury, July 22, 1983]

LOW-PROFILE LAUNCH FOR HIGH-TECH COMMISSION

(By Stephen Barlas)

The White House Commission on Industrial Competitiveness—the Reagan administration's first high-tech initiative—was launched with such a low profile that it immediately sank out of sight.

Ed Harper, the chief White House domestic policy aide and high-tech majordomo, says the commission reflects Reagan's ballyhooed State of the Union commitment to "keeping America the technological leader of the world now and into the 21st century."

But announcement of the commission was confined to a routine press release on June 28, even though the president held a press conference that day. Harper aides wrote a few paragraphs for the president to slip into his introductory statement at the press conference. But those paragraphs were never approved.

By keeping its supposedly significant high-tech foray a secret, the White House surprised John Young, chairman of the commission and president of Hewlett-Packard. On June 29, Young was at H-P's Palo Alto headquarters, expecting a barrage of inquiries from reporters. No one called. The next day, the only press mention he could find was a short squib from UPI identifying him as general manager of Hewlett-Packard's microwave division, a job he'd held 20 years before.

There may be more than a little understatement in an H-P spokesman's description of Young as "a bit surprised" at the commission's fumbled debut. Young "is not going to spend two minutes on this thing if he feels it is not well directed and supported—he'll drop it like a hot potato," the spokesman said.

According to this source, the White House later explained that the commission simply "got covered up" by the Carter briefing book affair. Young was assured there would be a replay—"a big announcement." That's expected within a week.

Apparently it has taken longer than expected to select the commissioner's 24 other members. Young remains the only one publicly named. Harper admits the White House has moved slowly, he attributes delays "to our own bureaucratic slowness."

And there are other problems. Harper, a former vice president at Emerson Electric where he concentrated on business strategy, was to direct the commission. Harper gets good grades for elevating the visibility of high-tech concerns within the White House. But he recently announced he is leaving the administration for private business.

The high-tech community apparently has more to worry about than the commission's inauspicious launch. The White House sees the commission as an instigator of a national debate on how technology can enhance American international competitiveness.

But according to Wendell Gunn, a Harper aide handling the commission, the administration is concerned about finding ways to use high technology to help industries such as auto and steel. Strengthening the high-tech sector for its own sake is a low priority for the White House, although Gunn thinks helping steel means helping semiconductors.

But he adds, "Trade issues of particular concern to high-tech companies are not a primary focus of this commission." He also points out "some of the biggest developers of high technology are big manufacturers like GM and Chrysler."

While the administration believes more talk is needed, one would have to be near deaf to have missed the coast-to-coast teeth gnashing over faltering U.S. competitiveness that has ground on for the last few years. Action, not just a commission, is called for.

But temporary inaction may be in the White House's best political interests. The commission is scheduled to present its prescriptions in September 1984. The presidential election will then be about a month away. Reagan, who seems likely to run, will have just enough time to use the commission recommendations in the campaign.

Whatever the White House's political motives, it is easy to be skeptical about the new Young Commission if one examines the fate of the Commission on Productivity chaired by former Treasury Secretary William Simon. It endorsed 44 recommendations last April. They were never even published. William Seidman, co-chair of that commission, says "none of them were major, earth-shaking things."●

MINNESOTA AND ONTARIO SET EXAMPLE ON ACID RAIN

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, in today's St. Paul Pioneer Press, an article written by Allen Short reports an historic acid rain study pact between the State of Minnesota and the Canadian Province of Ontario.

I strongly commend the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency Director, Sandra Gardebring and her counterpart in Ontario for this historic cooperative agreement to focus on acid rain. A similar agreement has also been reached between New York State and Ontario.

In 1980, Congress established the Interagency Task Force on Acid Precipitation, under the auspices of NOAA, and to coordinate a comprehensive study of acid rain. Unfortunately, progress on the acid rain study has been disappointing. NOAA, the EPA and other agencies, have followed a strategy of independence rather than cooperation. This has resulted in duplicated efforts and inefficiency. This bureaucratic haggling has frustrated our understanding and ability to deal with the problem.

Frankly, the Canadians seem, to be a step ahead of the United States. Initially, Canadians' public concern and awareness were ahead of ours. We have made gains. The American people are aware of the problem and concerned about the perils of acid rain. However, in developing the important information and data based necessary for a thorough acid rain research program, Canada is once again taking the lead.

I suspect that the administration's initial reluctance to cooperate with the Canadians is because it would require subordinating its antienvironmental policies to the reality of scientific inquiries and findings. We cannot afford to have the continued foot dragging by the Reagan administration and the Federal agencies that have been given this charge. There is everything to be gained by a joint United States/Canada coordination on the acid rain issue. There are not two different sets of scientific facts regarding this matter. The current independent approach that is being pursued will not bring any substantive results, only more infighting. Who benefits from that? Only those who wish to do nothing or those who will procrastinate until it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring the St. Paul Pioneer Press article to the attention of my colleagues. The cooperative agreement is most important and it reflects my concerns and the basic problems that exist in our acid rain research.

The article follows:

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press, Aug. 4, 1983]

MINNESOTA JOINS ACID RAIN PROJECT

(By Allen Short)

Stung by inaction by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Minnesota soon will begin tapping a $7 million-a-year acid rain research program operated by Ontario's Ministry of Environment, state officials said Wednesday.

A formal agreement by Minnesota and Ontario officials to share acid rain research and strategies will be signed Friday in Grand Portage by Sandra Gardebring, executive director of the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, and Ontario Minister of Environment Andrew Brandt.

"It is a formal policy statement recognizing acid rain as an important issue and announcing we both intend to put our resources toward it," Gardebring said. The agreement grew out of meetings last March involving Canadian officials, Gov. Rudy Perpich and Gardebring.

"The PCA and Ontario have similar views on the urgency of the problem, views the Environmental Protection Agency hasn't shared," said J. David Thornton, director of the Minnesota agency's acid rain research program.

Similar cooperative agreements on acid rain research are in effect between Ontario and the state of New York and between New York and Quebec Province.

"That two states have chosen to try to fight the problem with the help of Canadian provinces instead of the EPA says something about the U.S. approach," Thornton added. "The EPA is only just beginning the kind of research they have been conducting for years."

Under the cooperative agreement, Minnesota and Ontario will share technical information, including acid rain monitoring data, lake sensitivity studies and other research results.

Inventories of acid-causing air pollution sources in the United States and Canada will be programmed into an acid rain computer model that will trace the long-range transport of emissions from their sources to sensitive lakes and forests, Thornton said.

The computer model also will help researchers come up with specific air pollution reductions needed to protect sensitive areas in Minnesota and Ontario from acid fallout.

Acid rain occurs when emissions from power plants and industrial boilers fired by fossil fuels are converted in the atmosphere into sulfuric and nitric acids. The pollutants can fall back to Earth in the form of acid rain, snow, fog or dust, rendering streams and lakes unfit for fish and other aquatic life.

Thousands of lakes in Ontario, New York and Scandinavia have become acidified and thousands more in Minnesota, Ontario and other parts of North America are believed by scientists to be especially sensitive to acid rain's detrimental effects.

In a related development Tuesday, the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colo., announced it will spend $3.5 million over the next three years to produce a computer model for studying acid rain.

The proposed computer model will be more sophisticated than the one planned by Minnesota and Ontario. But Canadian researchers began work a year ago on a more complicated model, similar to the one proposed by the U.S. research center, and are expected to complete it sooner than the American researchers, Thornton said.

Such computer models can tell researchers how acids are transported and deposited in certain areas and at what point chemicals such as sulfur dioxide and nitrous oxides are transformed into acids.

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency will spend about $430,000 this year on acid rain research, far less than the $7 million a year spent by Ontario on monitoring and other acid rain research.

The agreement between Minnesota and Ontario is an open-ended one, requiring six months' notice by either party to cancel it. Gardebring estimated Wednesday it will remain in effect "at least four or five years."

Several proposals under study by Congress would require states to reduce their sulfur dioxide emissions by varying degrees to reduce acid deposition in the Northeast and Upper Midwest.

A long-awaited report by the EPA's top acid rain experts is expected to be presented to EPA administrator William Ruckelshaus this week. The report is expected to provide the first indication of what approach Ruckelshaus will recommend to President Reagan for curbing acid rain.●

U.S. MUST REVIVE EXPORT TRADE

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thurday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the economic recovery is threatened by high deficits and high interest rates. These conditions are adversely affecting the international economy as well as our own. Our export dependent industries are threatened by the rising strength of the dollar, making it difficult for our products to compete overseas. The administration has finally begun to act to intervene in currency markets to lower the dollar's value.

Our colleague, BERYL ANTHONY, JR., recently commented on the relationships among deficits, interest rates,

and exports in an article published in the July 28 issue of the Arkansas Gazette. The obervations he made were right on target regarding the necessity for intervention in currency markets. Apparently, the administration has seen the light as well since they have begun to intervene in currency markets during the past few days.

I commend the article to my colleagues.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, July 28, 1983]

U.S. MUST REVIVE EXPORT TRADE

(By Beryl Anthony)

Our hopes for better times ahead have been strenghtened by signs that economic recovery is under way in some of our important economic sectors. However, in the important area of industrial and agricultural exports, there is little or no sign of economic recovery. Unless the United States can revive its export industries and agriculture, the current hopes for a recovery are likely to be short lived. Unfortunately, the Reagan program offers modest hope that we can revive our export sector because it is based on continuing the very policies which have made it increasingly difficult for us to compete or sell our products abroad.

Our difficulties in exporting are linked directly to the fact that other nations have been experiencing recession at the same time. Some of these countries have massive debts and now find themselves unable to continue to purchase our products. However, an important reason for declining export performance since the end of 1980 is that the U.S. dollar has risen in value more than 22 per cent on the average against a variety of foreign currencies of our major trading partners. This makes our goods too expensive for foreign buyers and less competitive in world markets. Overvaluation of the dollar and the inability of our export sector to participate in the economic recovery are the main obstacles to recovery itself.

If recovery is to be sustained, federal deficits must be reduced because heavy government borrowing to meet these deficits drives up interest rates. This will help to moderate the dollar's value considerably because our high interest rates have been acting as a magnet for foreign capital to move into the U.S. for more than two years now. Lower U.S. interest rates will reduce the attraction of the U.S. dollar while increasing the value of currencies of other countries, thus enabling them to purchase more of our products and to be able to finance their own economic recovery.

The Republican-controlled Senate and the Democratic-controlled House recently agreed to a budget resolution for fiscal 1984 that would substantially reduce federal deficits. However, the Reagan administration has consistently opposed it, prefering deficits in excess of $200 billion per year to cuts in military expenditures and changes in the 1981 tax cut. An impasse has now developed which means that the tough decisions to reduce deficits may be postponed until after the 1984 presidential election.

Throughout the 1970s and until the end of 1980, the export sector of the U.S. economy expanded rapidly, reaching almost 13 per cent of GNP. But as the dollar has increased in value, the U.S. has experienced a growing trade deficit larger than any in our nation's history. The 1983 trade deficit is likely to exceed $70 billion, almost double the 1982 level.

So today, we find ourselves priced out of the world marketplace and our foreign trading partners often unable to afford the machinery, services, and foodstuff which we produce and which they need. From 1981 to 1982, the GNP declined by about $25 billion, and $10 billion of that was reflected in reduced export of goods and services.

The severe misalignment of currencies in the past 2½ years has cost millions of jobs in the U.S. and has contributed to making the economic recession worse than any since the Great Depression of the '30s.

The U.S. agricultural economy collapsed into depression at the end of 1980 because our farm programs were based on the hope of ever increasing exports. As the dollar rose in value and the world food and fiber marketplace shrunk, the U.S. farmer watched his prices slide well below production costs and remain there. The value of U.S. farm exports reached $43.8 billion in fiscal 1981 but declined to $39.1 billion in fiscal 1982.

The problems we are now experiencing in being unable to sell our products is not due to the inefficiency of U.S. industry or agriculture. It is not a matter of the productivity of U.S. workers or the willingness of U.S. exporters to compete. The problem is that the world recession has so distorted our currency relative to others for so long that it may have ended the U.S. role as a world trading nation. Pressures are already increasing for Congress to pass domestic content legislation and raise trade barriers to keep foreign goods from underselling American goods at home. It would be disastrous for the world to repeat the mistakes of the 1930's by retreating into protectionism rather than solving the problems of world trade.

THREE RECOMMENDATIONS

There are decisive actions which I believe would stimulate world trade and contribute to recovery:

We must resolve the impasse over the federal budget and continue to work to reduce deficits. That will require additional painful cuts in both military and civilian programs and additional revenue measures.

The Federal Reserve Board must loosen its grip on the money supply by providing liquidity needed for economic recovery. There is little sign of the return of inflation, and interest rates need to be lowered rather than raised.

Foreign governments must be persuaded to act jointly with the U.S. in intervening in the currency exchange markets to affect the direction and pace of currency fluctuations. The goal of this action should be to moderate the dollar's strength to a level more conducive to U.S. exports and growth in world trade. This action was urged by several foreign governments during both the Versailles and the Williamsburg summit conferences, but the Reagan administration has not responded favorably.

If the Federal Reserve Board and the administration continue to prefer a tight money policy at home and an indifference to the consequences of those policies on world trade, then I fear the worst. Our export sector cannot survive and broad-based economic recovery is unlikely if these policies continue unchanged.●

FALL RIVER COUNCIL SUPPORTS FREEZE

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, the city council of the city of Fall River, the largest city in my congressional district, recently passed a resolution supporting a bilateral and verifiable nuclear freeze. The resolution was sponsored by Councilor Stephen Camara and was supported by a 5-to-4 vote of the city council. As the resolution points out, its adoption follows the support expressed by the nuclear freeze by a substantial majority of Fall River citizens who voted in the 1982 State election.

I commend Councilor Camara and his colleagues on the Fall River City Council for their statement of support for the nuclear freeze and I ask that it be shared here with the membership.

Whereas, the greatest challenge facing the earth is to prevent the occurrence of nuclear war by accident or design; and

Whereas, the entire Massachusetts Congressional Delegation including Congressman Barney Frank recently supported House Joint Resolution 13 which calls for a mutual (bilateral) and verifiable freeze on and reduction in nuclear weapons; and

Whereas, this resolution (H.J. Res. 13) passed in the House of Representatives by more than a two-to-one margin; and

Whereas, at the November 2, 1982, Massachusetts State Election the voters of both the City of Fall River and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts supported by more than a two-to-one margin the referendum (Question 5) which calls for a mutual (bilateral) and verifiable freeze on and reduction in nuclear weapons; now, therefore

Be it resolved, that the Fall River City Council calls on United States Senators Edward Kennedy and Paul Tsongas to continue their efforts to have the United States Senate adopt Senate Joint Resolution 2 which calls for a mutual (bilateral) and verifiable freeze on and reduction in nuclear weapons; and

Be it further resolved, that the Fall River City Council calls on President Ronald Reagan to adopt as an arms control objective the resolution recently adopted by the U.S. House of Representatives (H.J. Res. 13) and currently being considered by the U.S. Senate.●

VIETNAM VETERANS INVOLVED IN NASA ACTIVITIES

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, in recent years, many dramatic and controversial events involving Vietnam veterans have been given a high priority in media coverage. It is with much pleasure that I inform my colleagues

that the recent flight of the space shuttle *Challenger* (STS-7), indeed a dramatic event, carried three Vietnam veterans into space. They are: Col. Frederick H. Hauck, USAF, shuttle pilot; John M. Fabian, mission specialist; Norman E. Thagard, mission specialist.

The following information includes a brief biography of each of these outstanding men as well as a synopsis of future Vietnam veteran involvement in NASA activities.

I gratefully acknowledge the efforts of the Veteran's Press Syndicate for its efforts in compiling this data.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

FREDERICK (RICK) H. HAUCK

Name: Frederick (Rick) H. Hauck (Captain, USN) NASA Astronaut.

Birthplace and date: Born April 11, 1941, in Long Beach, California, but considers Winchester, Massachusetts, and Washington, D.C., to be his hometowns. His mother, Mrs. Virginia Hauck, resides in Winchester, Massachusetts. His father was the late Captain Philip F. Hauck, USN.

Physical description: Blond hair; blue eyes; height: 5 feet 9 inches; weight: 175 pounds.

Education: Graduate from St. Albans School in Washington, D.C., in 1958; received a bachelor of science degree in Physics from Tufts University in 1962 and a master of science degree in Nuclear Engineering from MIT in 1966.

Marital status: Married to the former Dolly Bowman of Washington, D.C. Her father, Mr. Joseph E. Bowman, resides in Silver Spring, Maryland.

Children: Whitney Irene, March 6, 1963; Stephen Christopher, December 17, 1964.

Recreational interests: During his spare time, he enjoys skiing, sailing, racquetball, squash, and working on his 1951 pickup truck.

Organizations: Associate fellow, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics; and member, Society of Experimental Test Pilots.

Special honors: Awarded 9 Air Medals and the Navy Commendation Medal with Gold Star and Combat V. He was named the Navy's Outstanding Test Pilot for 1972.

Experience: Hauck, a Navy ROTC student at Tufts University, was commissioned upon graduation in 1962 and reported to the USS *Warrington* (DD-843) where he served 20 months as communications officer and CIC officer. In 1964, he attended the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, for studies in math and physics and, for a brief time in 1965, studied Russian at the Defense Language Institute in Monterey. Selected for the Navy's Advanced Science Program, he received his master's degree in Nuclear Engineering from MIT the next year.

He commenced flight training at the Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida, in 1966, and upon receiving his wings in 1968, he reported to the Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia, for replacement pilot training in the A-6. Hauck then reported to VA-35 where he served successively as line division officer, training officer, and safety officer. It was during this tour that he deployed to the Western Pacific with Air Wing 15 aboard USS *Coral Sea* (CVA-43), flying 114 combat and combat support missions.

In August 1970, Captain Hauck returned to the east coast A-6 replacement training squadron, VA-42, as a visual weapons delivery instructor. Selected for test pilot training, he reported to the U.S. Naval Test Pilot School at Patuxent River, Maryland, in 1971. A 3-year tour in the Naval Air Test Center's Carrier Suitability Branch of the Flight Test Division followed.

JOHN M. FABIAN

Name: John M. Fabian (Colonel, USAF) NASA Astronaut.

Birthplace and date: Born January 28, 1939, in Goosecreek, Texas, but considers Pullman, Washington to be his hometown. His parents, Dr. and Mrs. Felix M. Fabian, Sr., reside in Longview, Texas.

Physical description: Brown hair; green eyes; height: 6 feet 1 inch; weight: 175 pounds.

Education: Graduated from Pullman High School, Pullman, Washington, 1957; received a bachelor of science degree in Mechanical Engineering from Washington State University in 1962; a master of science in Aerospace Engineering from the Air Force Institute of Technology in 1964; and a doctorate in Aeronautics and Astronautics from the University of Washington in 1974..

Marital status: Married to the former Donna Kay Buboltz of Spokane, Washingtohn; her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ted Buboltz, are residents of Seattle, Washington.

Children: Michael K., August 6, 1962; Amy L., November 15, 1965.

Recreational interests: He enjoys skiing, stamp collecting, and jogging.

Organizations: Member, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, the Tau Beta Pi, the Sigma Tau, the Phi Sigma Kappa, the Order of Daedalians, and the Boy Scouts of America.

Special honors: Awarded an Air Force Meritorious Service Medal, and Air Medal with 2 Oak Leaf Clusters, an Air Force Commendation Medal, the Combat Readiness Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Campaign Medal, Vietnam Cross of Gallantry with Palm, Vietnam Service Medal, the Washington State University Sloan Engineering Award (1961), the Air Training Command Academic Training Award (1966), the Squadron Officer School Commandant's Trophy (1968), the Squadron Officer School Chief of Staff Award (1968).

Experience: Fabian, an Air Force ROTC student at Washington State University, was commissioned upon graduation in 1962. After an assignment at the Air Force Institute of Technology at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, he was assigned as an aeronautical engineer in the service engineering division, San Antonio Air Material Area, Kelly Air Force Base, Texas. He then attended flight training at Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, and subsequently spent 5 years as a KC-135 pilot at Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan. He saw action in Southeast Asia, flying 90 combat missions. Following additional graduate work at the University of Washington, he served 4 years on the faculty of the Aeronautics Department at the USAF Academy in Colorado.

He has logged 3,400 hours flying time, including 9,000 hours in jet aircraft.

NASA experience: Colonel Fabian was selected as an astronaut candidate by NASA in January 1978. In August 1979, he completed a 1-year training and evaluation period making him eligible for assignment as a mission specialist on future space shuttle flight crews.

Current assignment: Colonel Fabian has been selected to serve as a mission specialist for STS-7—a planned 6-day flight of the orbiter *Challenger*.

NORMAN E. THAGARD

Name: Norman E. Thagard (MD) NASA Astronaut.

Birthplace and date: Born July 3, 1943, in Marianna, Florida, but considers Jacksonville, Florida, to be his hometown. His father, Mr. James E. Thagard, resides in Palm Desert, California; his mother, Mrs. Mary F. Nicholson, is a resident of St. Petersburg, Florida.

Physical description: Brown hair; blue eyes; height: 5 feet 9 inches; weight: 164 pounds.

Education: Graduated from Paxon Senior High School, Jacksonville, Florida, in 1961; attended Florida State University where he received bachelor and master of science degrees in Engineering Science in 1965 and 1966, respectively, and subsequently performed pre-med course-work; received a doctor of Medicine from the University of Texas Southwestern Medical School in 1977.

Marital status: Married to the former Rex Kirby Johnson of Atlanta, Georgia. Her mother, Mrs. Rex Johnson, resides in Dallas, Texas.

Children: Norman Gordon, May 15, 1968; James Robert, November 29, 1970; Daniel Cary, November 22, 1979.

Recreational interests: During his free time, he enjoys classical music and high-fidelity sound reproduction, and digital electronic design/computers.

Organization: Member of American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, and Phi Kappa Phi.

Special honors: Awarded 11 Air Medals, the Navy Commendation Medal with Combat V, the Marine Corps "E" Award, the Vietnam Service Medal, and the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry with Palm.

Experience: Dr. Thagard held a number of research and teaching posts while completing the academic requirements for various earned degrees.

In September 1966, he entered on active duty with the United States Marine Corps Reserve. He achieved the rank of Captain in 1967, was designated a naval aviator in 1968, and was subsequently assigned to duty flying F-4's with VMFA-333 at Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, South Carolina. He flew 163 combat missions in Vietnam while assigned to VMFA-115 from January 1969 to 1970. He returned to the United States and an assignment as aviation weapons division officer with VMFA-251 at the Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, South Carolina.

Thagard resumed his academic studies in 1971, pursuing a degree in medicine; and prior to coming to NASA, was interning in the Department of Internal Medicine at the Medical University of South Carolina.

He has logged 800 hours flying time, which includes 775 hours in jet aircraft.

NASA experience: Dr. Thagard was selected as an astronaut candidate by NASA in January 1978. In August 1979, he completed a 1-year training and evaluation period, making him eligible for assignment as a mission specialist on future space shuttle flight crews.

Current assignment: Thagard has been selected to serve as a mission specialist for STS-7—a planned 6-day flight in the orbiter Challenger.

VIETNAM VETERAN ASTRONAUTS

Groups One through Seven included no Vietnam veterans.

Group Eight

Bluford, Guion S., Jr.
Brandenstein, Daniel C.
Buchli, James F.
Coats, Nichael L.
Covey, Richard O.
Creighton, John O.
Fabian, John M.
Gibson, Robert L.
Gregory, Frederick D.
Griggs, Stanley D.
Hauck, Frederick H.
McBride, Jon A.
Mullane, Richard M.
Nagel, Steven R.
Scobee, Francis R.
Shaw, Brewster H., Jr.
Stewart, Robert L.
Thagard, Norman E.
van Hoften, James D.
Walker, David M.
Williams, Donald E.

Group Nine

Blaha, John E.
Bolden, Charles F., Jr.
Bridges, Roy D., Jr.
Gardner, Guy S.
Grabe, Ronald J.
Lounge, John M.
Richards, Richard N.
Smith, Michael J.
Spring, Sherwood C.
Springer, Robert C.

GENERAL INFORMATION

VietVet astronauts number: 31.

All astronauts since 1959 number: 127.

VietVets account for 24.4 percent of all astronauts.

VietVet astronauts in flight status: 31.

Total astronauts in flight status: 78.

VietVets account for 39.7 percent of all astronauts in flight status.

First flight to contain VietVets: STS-7.

First black man in space: Bluford, Guion S., Jr.

First black man to pilot a U.S. space vessel: Gregory, Frederick D.

First U.S. Army man to obtain flight status: Stewart, Robert L.

First U.S. Army man in space: Stewart, Robert L.

Of the fourteen manifested flights (STS-1, STS-13 and STS-18) six (6) or 42.8 percent will be piloted by VietVets.

Of the eight flights to contain VietVets, VietVets will make up 38.4 percent (15 of 39—41 minus two repeat fliers) of the total astronauts in space.●

ELIZABETH J. AYCOCK

HON. TIM VALENTINE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, for more than a quarter of a century, Research Triangle Park in North Carolina has benefited from the vision and dedication of Elizabeth J. Aycock. A recent article in the Raleigh News & Observer gives an excellent description of her outstanding achievements, and I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Raleigh News & Observer, July 31, 1983]

FROM PINEY WOODS TO RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK

(By Guy Munger)

North Carolina's Research Triangle Park has many fathers, the late Gov. Luther Hodges, sociologists Howard Odum and George L. Simpson Jr., industrialist Robert M. Hanes, contractor Romeo H. Guest, to name just a few.

But no one has stepped forward to challenge Elizabeth Johnson Aycock as the woman who has had the most to do with the park's growth.

George Watts Hill of Chapel Hill, the businessman who was Mrs. Aycock's predecessor as secretary of the Research Triangle Foundation, once dubbed her "Mrs. Research Triangle," and no one has disagreed.

William C. Friday, president of the University of North Carolina, said of Mrs. Aycock: "She is the last of the original staff of the Triangle and no one has given as much intelligent effort to the enterprise as has she."

A native of Smithfield, Mrs. Aycock graduated from Smithfield High School and King's College in Raleigh. She met her husband, Milford Edmund Aycock, now chairman of the Wake County Board of Commissioners, when they were attending a 4-H meeting at what was then State College.

In an interview last week, Mrs. Aycock recalled when the Research Triangle entered her life:

"The same day that George Simpson offered me the job to come with the Research Triangle, the president of King's College—of course I'd been out and working for many years—offered me a job there at King's, so I had a choice to make between an old, established school and somthing that was very nebulous.

"But I knew that Robert Hanes and Governor Hodges were accustomed to success and would not fail.

"George Simpson and I started to work together Sept. 25, 1965, in the first office—on the second floor of a beautiful old home on Edenton Street next to the Education Building. Mr. Hanes went to his furniture manufacturer friends and they gave us two desks. We had to borrow chairs from the office on the first floor.

"George was the director and I was his secretary and office manager.

". . . The work just evolved. Whatever there was to do we did—press releases, brochures, whatever was needed. When you grow with something like this you know what has to be done."

A major step forward occurred when the Pinelands Co. later absorbed into the Research Triangle Foundation, bought land for the Research Triangle Park between Raleigh, Durham and Chapel Hill.

"When we first learned that the land for a research center could be acquired I rode out that afternoon after work to where the property was," Mrs. Aycock said.

"It was a summer afternoon in June of 1967 and it was farmland—pastures, piney woods and broomsedge grass. And the land was in its native state.

"Now, when I come out and see those manicured lawns and attractive buildings, I really have to think back about 24 years when we actually move to the park.

"Today, there is a science city here of more than 20,000 people. And 27 years ago this fall when we were incorporated, there were only two of those jobs existing in North Carolina. All the others have been added."

Mrs. Aycock talked of the major developments in the Research Triangle Park—the announcement by Chemstrand in May 1959 that it would become the park's first tenant, the arrival of IBM, Burroughs-Wellcome, the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences and all the others, development of the Triangle Services Center with the Governors Inn and other support businesses.

She said some of the changes have been in human terms: "Back then there were only two paved roads going through the park. And there were no public eating facilities. You brown-bagged for lunch."

Other changes have been in kinds of research, like the arrival of the National Humanities Center in 1978:

"Twenty-six locations across the United States wanted the Humanities Center. Because we have this consortium of three major universities (UNC, Duke and N.C. State), we were able to get it.

Mrs. Aycock helped the Humanities Center locate in the park, finding staff workers and attending to other details, and is pleased with the results.

"In five years, almost 150 scholars from all over the world have come here to work," she said.

". . . You see we had started off in the physical sciences and the natural sciences, then later moved into the social sciences at the Research Triangle Institute. But the National Humanities Center, that brought a new dimension to the park.

". . . This (the park) was not meant to be an overnight development and success has come far faster than anyone envisioned.

". . . When you think about your market, there are very few research facilities built in the United States in any one year. We have 35 or so in a span of 25 years. That's more than 1½ a year. It's an inspiring success story."

"There were some years that were what I call the blood-sweat-and-tears years. You don't embark on a venture such as this and plan it and have instant success.

"That's what we have to tell all these people who come here from various other states and countries, that it just doesn't happen overnight. It takes a lot of planning, it takes a lot of hard work, it takes persistence in the face of difficulty and it also took a lot of philanthropy because this was started with contributed funds."

"I feel very fortunate to have worked and work now with the people we have been involved with. It is the academic leadership and the governmental and business and industrial leadership working together for the good of the people that have made this thing happen."

Mrs. Aycock said she expects the Research Triangle Park to continue to grow but warned that it will take a sustained effort:

"People aren't just standing on our door out there wanting to come in to buy land. We are well-known now, of course, internationally, and it took a lot of hard work to spread the word, that there was a location for research facilities and that North Carolina was a good place to live. But you don't convince executives of IBM or Burroughs-Wellcome to move to North Carolina overnight."

As for her own future, Mrs. Aycock said she likes to travel with her husband, read and do needlework and is never bored.

"I wish I didn't have to sleep," she said. "There's not enought time to do all the things I want to do. And with all the new technology that's coming along, it makes you want to live another 50 or 100 years just to see what the world is going to be like. I enjoy getting up in the morning and seeing what the world is going to be like that day."

She paused a moment, then added: "No rocking chair for me."●

THE 2-PERCENT SOLUTION

HON. CARROLL A. CAMPBELL, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with Representative JIM JONES and Representative JIM MARTIN, along with a bipartisan group of House Members that includes BOB LIVINGSTON, HANK BROWN, STEVE BARTLETT, BERYL ANTHONY, and DAVE MCCURDY, in introducing legislation that will at last make a real dent in the deficit and begin the painful process of regaining congressional control over the management of the budget. I call this concept the 2-percent solution, although it is certainly not the whole solution. But it is a start in taking the budget off automatic pilot.

Our bill represents a fair and balanced approach to economic sanity, in that it would have a minimal impact on most Americans. It requires that annual adjustments in both nonmeans-tested automatic outlay programs and tax indexing be tied to a 2-percent trigger and only that amount over a 2-percent increase in the Consumer Price Index be awarded. In other words, if the inflation rate is 8 percent, programs tied to automatic cost-of-living increases would be adjusted by 6 percent; likewise, the bill would require 2 percent smaller reductions in personal income taxes than increases in the CPI. The bill would be sunsetted in 1990. In the 4-year period between fiscal years 1985 and 1988 alone, the House Budget Committee estimates a savings of $77.55 billion.

I want to stress that, from my point of view, the elements of this bill are inseparable. Although I am a strong supporter of tax indexing, I am willing to support a modest adjustment in this provision, but only if it is tied to an adjustment in the automatic COLA concept. I am willing to do this because I believe so strongly that we have got to start somewhere to get a handle on the three-quarters of the Federal budget that is now uncontrollable. We have got to take that first step in dealing with budget deficits on the order of $200 billion. We cannot deal with those deficits by cutting discretionary programs such as education, vocational rehabilitation, job training, that we have already pared to the bone. We cannot deal with the deficits by adding more tax programs on our already overburdened taxpayers. We can, however, make meaningful reductions in the deficits and send the right signal without cutting a single program and without adding new tax programs. We can do it by adopting the 2-percent solution.

This legislation builds on the notion in current law that people can cope with minimal inflation. As the law now stands, COLA's are not awarded in years when the inflation is 3 percent of less. Our bill would actually liberalize that concept by allowing adjustments for inflation over 2 percent, while asking taxpayers and nonmeans-tested benefit recipients alike to cope with minimal inflation. This is fair, particularly since the Consumer Price Index tends to overstate true consumer inflation—the CPI caused government benefits to increase 22 percent more than was needed to preserve recipients' purchasing power during the last 10 years. During that period, the CPI grew 129.7 percent while the average wages of Americans working in the private sector grew only 102 percent. I would also add that slowing the growth in automatic spending programs would not apply to the very poor, since means-tested benefits are exempted.

The fact is, we must begin to get this situation under control or we will forever be fighting the same budget battles we have seen in recent years. Congress has lost the ability to allocate resources, which has forced budget cuts in areas we ought to be increasing. Even so, because of automatic outlay programs, we have sustained high deficits reviving expectations of higher interest rates and siphoning a record 75 percent of net domestic savings away from use by the people. Already interest rates have increased 1 percentage point or more during the last 2 months, because of huge deficits planned for future years.

If we adopt the 2-percent solution, however, if we can make this move and the marketplace sees that we are serious about bringing down these deficits, then we will see interest rates come down, thus encouraging investment, creating jobs, keeping inflation down and keeping America growing.

Efforts have been made to adjust the Tax Code to provide for a supply side pull for the economy. This has worked. However, we did not adjust our outlay programs to compensate for the lag period between the time of the tax cut and the time that the economy recovers. This is the adjustment we are seeking here.

Mr. Speaker, the 2-percent solution is a bipartisan congressional initiative designed to bring a fresh approach to the budget process by moving away from automatically increasing outlays. It is an honest effort to take definitive and responsible action to reduce unacceptable deficits. Very frankly, I believe Americans will be willing to accept the impact on them, knowing that impact is across the board and fairly shared by both recipients and taxpayers.●

INTERNATIONAL YOUTH EXCHANGE MONTH

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce a joint resolution which proclaims that the month of October 1983 be named "International Youth Exchange Month."

I have long believed that exchange programs between the United States and other countries of the world make a major contribution to peace among nations. Knowledge of other peoples—their cultures, their aspirations, their hopes and fears—diminishes sterotypes and easy assumptions about others. Exchange programs, and especially programs for young people, build these bridges of understanding.

Nothing therefore could be more appropriate than the proclamation of International Youth Exchange Month. At a time in our history when more than ever before we need the understanding of others, we need to bring to the attention of all our citizens the importance to this Nation of international exchanges. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this resolution.●

MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Peoria Journal-Star has recently published some thought-provoking editorials on this Nation's deepening military involvement in Central America. A number of those editorials have drawn sharp parallels between these recent developments and our tragic experience in Vietnam.

I have asked that two of the Journal-Star editorials be reprinted in the RECORD:

[From the Peoria Journal Star July 28, 1983]

ROUTINE MANEUVERS

Not even the Great Communicator can make Americans believe that all the troops and ships he is sending to Central America this summer are there on routine maneuvers.

That's what President Reagan said at his press conference Tuesday night. Here is the transcript of his first question and answer:

Q. Mr. President, you complain of too much attention. How can the people ignore two battleship groups, thousands of combat troops going to Honduras, it is said the covert funding of 10,000 rebels, Nicaraguan rebels? My question—and all these things have happened since April 27th—my ques-

tion, sir, is, in seeking solutions, how far will you go militarily?

A. Well, I have told you, we have no military plans for intervention of that kind. We have 55 mainly noncommissioned officers helping to train the Salvadoran army. We know that Cuba has somewhere in the—well, it has thousands of military personnel in Nicaragua. It does seem a little overbalanced with regard to the attention that's being paid to 55 as against attention that's being paid to the thousands.

The—I suppose what my question is, Helen, back—to answer with a question, is why are maneuvers that we have performed before and regularly suddenly treated with such suspicion when only—well, within this year, last spring, we had military maneuvers in Honduras, and last year we have naval maneuvers in the Caribbean and no one seemed to be excited about them at all. So, is it just that there's no confidence in the fact that when I say these are maneuvers of the kind we've been holding regularly and for years?

Yes, he has hit it right on the head: there is no confidence in his saying that these are just routine military exercises.

He is wrong in trying to make us believe that they are. If he cannot tell us the full truth—and there are times when a president cannot—he should not hold a press conference and pretend to tell us the truth.

Columnist Patrict Buchanan, not exactly a Reagan-baiter, said this yesterday about the military forces converging on Central America:

"With the dispatch of the U.S. battle fleets to the Pacific and Caribbean coasts of Central America, the president has issued a statement to the world: A Soviet satellite state and military base in Central America are unacceptable to the United States."

That may or may not be good foreign policy, but we certainly agree with Buchanan that this is the statement Reagan was issuing to the world. He should not be publicly asserting that it wasn't.

The aircraft carrier Ranger left San Diego last week for what was supposed to be a seven-month tour of Pearl Harbor, Singapore and the Philippines. But a day out of port it changes course for international waters in the Pacific ocean off the coast of Nicaragua, rendezvousing with seven other naval ships.

The battleship New Jersey, armed with 16-inch guns and two types of cruise missiles, cut short a Far Eastern tour and headed across the Pacific to join the Ranger and the other vessels.

The Pentagon suggested to the White House that the number of U.S. military advisers in El Salvador—now 55—be doubled. (The president said this recommendation has not yet reached his desk.)

The aircraft carrier Coral Sea, in port in Naples, Italy, is said to be about to depart for the Caribbean, where it is expected to operate along Central America's eastern coast.

By trying to play down the saber rattling that he had already set in motion, the president, we believe, was tacitly acknowledging the fear that exists throughout the country that he is flirting dangerously with another Vietnam-like adventure.

We share that fear, and we hope we are correct in detecting signs of presidential backpedaling.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, July 31, 1983]

VIETNAM REMEMBERED

President Reagan says that what he is doing in Central America bears no relationship to what happened to the United States in Vietnam.

"There is no comparison with Vietnam," he said at his press conference last week, "and there's not going to be anything of that kind in this." And, he added, "no one has presented a proposal to me" for an increase in U.S. advisers in El Salvador.

His comments are so reminiscent of those from President Kennedy's administration 20 years ago, as we were inching into the Vietnam War, that we looked up the record and offer it to readers, who can decide for themselves whether there is a comparison.

We are also mindful of the candid warning from former Attorney General John Mitchell during the Nixon administration: "Watch what we do, not what we say."

Here's a partial chronology of what they were saying—and doing—at the time of Vietnam:

The year is 1961. The United States has had military advisers in South Vietnam ever since 18 Army officers were sent there secretly in 1954, after the defeat of the French. Since then the number has grown to 685 as Communist guerrillas stepped up their offensive.

May, 1961. President Kennedy sends Vice President Johnson to Southeast Asia on a fact-finding mission. Secretary of State Dean Rusk says the U.S. will give South Vietnam "every possible help, across the entire spectrum in which help is needed." But he refuses to say whether the U.S. will intervene militarily.

Upon his return, Johnson says that no country he visited has requested U.S. troops and that the U.S. does not plan to send armed forces to Asia.

August, 1961. The U.S. says in a joint communique issued with Nationalist China that South Vietnam "shall not be lost to the Communist for lack of any (U.S.) support."

October, 1961. President Kennedy sends Gen. Maxwell Taylor to Saigon "to discuss . . . ways in which we can perhaps better assist . . . Vietnam in meeting . . . (the) threat to its independence." When reporters ask him whether the U.S. is considering sending troops there, the president says "we're going to wait till Gen. Taylor comes back . . . and then we can come to conclusions."

Gen. Taylor, upon departing for Southeast Asia, says "any American would be reluctant to use troops (in Vietnam) unless absolutely necessary." The State Department says "Vietnam assures us . . . that with U.S. material assistance and training services, it can handle the present Communist aggressive attacks."

November, 1961. Gen. Taylor returns to Washington, saying Vietnam has the resources "to prevail against the Communist threat." He declines to say whether he will recommend that the U.S. send troops there, but administration officials say his comment about Vietnam's resources means he does not favor sending combat forces.

Press reports from Vietnam say that large amounts of U.S. supplies have begun arriving from Clark Field in the Philippines and that hotels is Saigon are filled with U.S. military officers.

December, 1961. Thirty-three U.S. Army helicopters and 400 crewmen assigned to operate them for the South Vietnamese Army arrive in Saigon, the first overt indication of direct U.S. involvement. Secretary Rusk says the country is in "clear and present danger" of Communist conquest.

And so on, into 1962.

January, 1962. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara says in Washington that South Vietnam's position is "encouraging."

February, 1962. Two U.S. helicopters are shot down in attacks on Vietcong guerrillas. President Kennedy says, "There is a war going on in South Vietnam . . . We are out there on training and on transportation, and we are assisting in every way we properly can."

Republicans challenge Kennedy to tell the nation whether we are "moving toward another Korea" and to "drop the pretense that the United States is merely acting as military adviser to South Vietnam." The president replies that "the training missions that we have there have been instructed that if they are fired upon they are of course to fire back, but we have not sent combat troops in the generally understood sense of the word."

The New York Times reports that the U.S. now has nearly 5,000 military personnel in South Vietnam, plus Navy destroyers patrolling for seaborne Vietcong infiltration.

March-May, 1962. U.S. involvement in the fighting escalates, but Secretary McNamara says "there is no plan for introducing (American) combat forces in South Vietnam." Forty-six Americans have been reported killed since December 1961.

September, 1962. Gen. Taylor says the South Vietnamese "are on the road to victory." The U.S. has 11,000 "advisers" and "technicians" in South Vietnam.

The fighting rages on, and U.S. involvement deepens. Here, hastily, is a chronology of it:

1963. Secretary McNamara says "the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965." Adm. Harry Felt, commander-in-chief of U.S. forces in the Pacific, says Viet Cong defeat is "inevitable." The U.S. now has more than 16,000 troops there, and American casualties now total 141 dead, 14 missing.

1964. President Johnson, claiming North Vietnamese torpedo boats attacked two U.S. destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin, orders retaliatory attacks on the gunboats and their home bases. Congress approves the Tonkin Resolution, giving Johnson a free hand to protect Southeast Asia from attack. U.S. troop strength rises to 19,500.

1965. U.S. forces now total 145,000. U.S. death toll: 830. Gen William C. Westmoreland, commander of U.S. forces sees "a long conflict."

1966. President Johnson pledges there will be no "mindless escalation" of the war. By year's end, there are 308,000 Americans in South Vietnam, and a total of 5,000 have been killed.

1967. The U.S. has 475,000 troops there.

1968. President Johnson, announcing he will not run for re-election, tries a bombing halt to try to get peace talks going.

1969. There are now 543,000 American troops in South Vietnam. President Nixon says the war "may have been our finest hour."

1970. U.S. troop strength down to 284,000. Combat forces sent into Cambodia.

1971. Nixon brings more troops home; strength now 139,000. Secret peace talks underway.

1972. All U.S. combat troops leave Vietnam, but bombings continue.

1973. Peace treaty signed in Paris and all U.S. military operations cease.

1975. South Vietnam surrenders to the Vietcong and North Vietnamese.

U.S. casualties in the war totaled more than 214,000. Some 47,700 were killed in battle, another 10,900 died outside of battle and 155,400 were wounded.

Just as the Republicans worried in 1962 whether the Kennedy administration was leading the country into another Korea, we worry today about whether the Reagan administration is leading us into another Vietnam.

We are listening to what the president says—and we are watching what he does—and we are not reassured.●

INTRODUCTION OF COLUMBIA GORGE LEGISLATION INTRODUCED AT THE REQUEST OF THE GOVERNORS OF THE STATE OF OREGON AND WASHINGTON

HON. SID MORRISON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the bill being introduced by the Washington and Oregon congressional teams reprsents a recognition of the efforts of our two Governors

The proposal incorporates some basic elements that I believe are vital if we are to achieve protection of the scenic value of the Columbia River Gorge. First is local control. The administering Commission is dominated by appointees living in the impacted area of the gorge. There is no Federal authority associated with the Park Service, the Forest Service, or any other Federal agency in this legislation.

Second is restricted authority and protection of private property. The Commission will implement its management plan through local governments, and has available a very restricted power of eminent domain with exemptions for all properties outside of the defined critical areas, all existing buildings, and all farming and forestry activities. Any use of eminent domain must be after all other options fail and with a two-thirds majority of the Commission.

I am requesting today that the appropriate committees of the House and Senate hold field hearings in the area of the four counties impacted so that local inhabitants can better understand and easily react to this proposal.

It is also of importance to me that this proposal for the Columbia River Gorge not delay the consideration of a much-needed Washington wilderness compromise that is currently under discussion.●

H.R. 3805—THE TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 1983

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H.R. 3805, the Technical Corrections Act of 1983. This bill would make technical, clerical, conforming, and clarifying amendments to certain tax and other legislation enacted during 1982 and early 1983. The bill contains four general titles. The first title covers technical, clerical, and conforming amendments to the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (TEFRA). The second title covers amendments to the Subchapter S Revision Act of 1982 and the Technical Corrections Act of 1982. The third title contains amendments to the Highway Revenue Act of 1982. Title IV, the last title, would make technical and clarifying amendments to the Social Security Act Amendments of 1983, the medicare provisions of TEFRA, and related legislation.

This bill is intended to correct errors in these enacted bills in order to properly carry out the intent of Congress in enacting the earlier legislation. The bill has been prepared by the staffs of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Joint Committee on Taxation with valuable assistance from the Treasury Department, the Social Security Administration, and the Health Care Financing Administration. Helpful comments have also been received from the American Bar Association, the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, and other professional groups and individuals.

The bill, for example, would clarify that a provision in the Highway Revenue Act of 1982 relating to the treatment of interest on certain tax-exempt obligations received by mutual funds would take effect, notwithstanding that it could be argued that the signing by the President of Public Law 97-473 after the signing of the Highway Act terminated this provision in the Highway Act.

In title I, the bill would make several technical amendments to the merger and acquisition provisions of TEFRA. For example, amendments would be made to new code section 338 to extend for an additional 6 months the time for making a section 338 election, and to conform the definition of "purchase" more closely to the prior law definition in code section 334(b)(2). Also amendments are included to clarify the determination of the recapture amounts and the application of the so-called surrogate tax applicable where all the stock of the target corporation is not acquired, and to clarify the application of code section 269 to certain acquisitions followed by a liquidation. An amendment to code section 304 would be made to clarify that section 304 would not override the corporate reorganization provisions, but would override incorporations under code section 351. An amendment would be made to clarify the treatment of partial liquidations where the shareholder is a partnership or other passthrough entity. A number of other clarifying amendments to these TEFRA provisions are also included.

Under the bill, certain amendments are proposed to the pension provisions of TEFRA. Clarifying amendments would be made to the limits on contributions and benefits under section 415—including a provision that raises the deduction limit—for simplified employee pensions (SEP's), to the rules relating to the treatment of loans to participants from qualified pension plans, and to the TEFRA parity provisions. In addition, the bill would make clarifying and technical amendments to the TEFRA top heavy rules. Several changes would be made to the pension rules that require distributions to be made to participants or beneficiaries upon the occurrence of stated events. Specifically, the bill would permit distributions to be made to a beneficiary of a participant for a period longer than 5 years after the participant's death if the beneficiary is a dependent—within the meaning of section 152—who is under age 22 or is permanently and totally disabled. The bill delays the effective date of this amended provision as it relates to Government plans to 1985, in order to permit the States sufficient time to conform their statutes to these changes. Finally, the bill would make clarifying amendments to the pension withholding rules adopted in TEFRA.

Other clarifying amendments to TEFRA included in title I relate to the individual and corporate minimum tax, the casualty loss deduction, the capitalization of interest and taxes by a cooperative housing corporation, and the awarding of attorney's fees in the claims court.

In title II of the bill, a number of technical amendments to the Subchapter S Revision Act of 1982 are included. The bill would clarify that corporate gain or loss would not be recognized on the complete liquidation of an S corporation or on the distribution of certain stock in a reorganization. Rules applicable to the treatment of income from discharge of an S corporation debt and the treatment of worthless debt would be clarified. Other amendments relate to the treatment of certain inactive subsidiaries, investment tax credit recapture, qualified subchapter S trusts, coordination with section 338, attribution of ownership, and certain short taxable years. Also a corporation could elect to have the old passive income rules apply

during 1982. Finally, a few minor corrections to the Technical Corrections Act of 1982 are included.

In title III, technical, clarifying and conforming amendments would be made to the Highway Revenue Act of 1982. These include an amendment to clarify the application of the 4 cents a gallon tax on gasohol and the availability of floor stock refunds on tax-reduced tires.

Title IV of the bill includes changes in title II of the Social Security Act and related legislation. For the most part, these changes became necessary as a result of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1983 (Public Law 98-21) and are primarily clerical in nature. However, some of the changes were necessitated by earlier legislation.

Technical provisions in this title of the bill relating to social security include a clarification of that provision of the 1983 amendments which provides for the coverage of Federal employees who are newly hired after December 31, 1983. This amendment would correct an anomolous situation in which a Federal worker who is already covered by social security would be excluded from coverage if he left his covered job and returned to Federal employment within less than 1 calendar year since he would not qualify as a newly hired employee. In addition, an amendment clarifying the effective date of those sections of the bill dealing with the coverage status of wages which are excluded from the income tax base is included in this section.

The title IV provisions which relate to medicare would make technical and clarifying changes in TEFRA and the Social Security Amendments of 1983. For example in subtitle B, section 411(a) would clarify that Professional Standards Review Organizations (PSRO's) would be treated in a manner similar to that applied to Utilization and Quality Control Peer Review Organizations (also known as PRO's) under the Social Security Amendments of 1983 while the transition is being made from PSRO's to PRO's.

Section 411(b) of the bill would clarify the application and implementation of the medicare prospective payment system by making it clear that the antigaming and unbundling provisions were intended to apply to State hospital control systems; that public comment is required only on proposed determinations issued with respect to annual indexing of diagnosis-related groups (DRG's) on June 1 of each year, beginning with fiscal year 1986; that exempt hospitals are required to have agreements with peer review organizations; and that the consolidated review changes in the Provider Reimbursement Review Board (PRRB) apply to group appeals as well as appeals of providers under common ownership and control.

Section 411(c) of the bill reverses with respect to the hospital insurance Trust fund a provision of the Social Security Amendments which provided for normalization of the social security trust funds. Section 411(d) of the bill clarifies that changes in the PRRB rules respecting group appeals only apply to appeals brought after April 20, 1983, and also that the rules for implementing all the medicare amendments in the Social Security Act of 1983 are permitted to be made on an interim-final basis.

Finally, section 412(a) of the bill corrects an inadvertent effect of the TEFRA provision which provides for medicare to be the secondary payor to any employer group health plan for persons 65 to 70 years of age. Normally, a penalty is imposed on persons who elect medicare part B subsequent to their initial statutory enrollment period; in addition, later enrollment periods are, under current law, limited to the first quarter of each year. Recognizing that the TEFRA provision was intended to encourage persons to maintain coverage under their employer plans and to enroll in medicare at a later date, the provision relieves persons who continue to work and are covered by a group health plan from the penalty and makes certain provisions for special enrollment periods.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to emphasize that this bill intends simply to correct technical errors and to better reflect the policies established by the Congress in enacting the original legislation. In several areas covered by the bill, technical amendments are proposed to very complex provisions of law, and the legislation will benefit from careful study by interested groups and individuals in the months ahead. Further, time has not permitted a thorough review of all the provisions enacted last year, and I am sure additional changes that need to be made will come to our attention during the legislative process.●

RETIREMENT OF A GREAT EDUCATOR: GIBB R. MADSEN

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues the retirement of the president of Hartnell College in Salinas, Calif., Dr. Gibb R. Madsen. Dr. Madsen served in that post for 13 years, and the school had made tremendous advances under this leadership.

Gibb Madsen had a long career in education, beginning at the University of Utah. Then from 1948 to 1962, for 14 years, he served as principal of Granite High School in Salt Lake City. From 1962 to 1967, Dr. Madsen served as the dean of students and as an instructor and counselor at Foothill College. In the late 1960's, he was the first superintendent-president at Butte College in Butte County, Calif., and dean of students at Chabot College in Hayward. Then, in 1970, Dr. Madsen became president of Hartnell College, and he just recently retired from that post.

In addition to his tremendous experience working as an educational administrator and teacher, Dr. Madsen was very active in educational and professional organizations. He is a past president of the Utah Education Association, past president of the Salinas Rotary Club, a member of the board of directors of the chamber of commerce, president of the Northern California Community College Chief Executive Officers, and president of the California Youth Symphony.

The Salinas community has been very proud of Dr. Madsen's work at Hartnell College and of his various community and professional activities. Hartnell College is known as one of the finest junior colleges in the State of California, and Dr. Madsen can take a great deal of the credit for that fact.

It is my understanding that Dr. Madsen intends to travel and do a good deal of reading and writing, as well as many other activities, in his retirement. I know my colleagues join me in wishing him the best of luck in his retirement. It is my hope as well that Dr. Madsen does not abandon the field of education entirely and continues to contribute his knowledge and experience to education in the Salinas area. At a time when our Nation is recognizing once again the importance of a strong educational system, we cannot afford to waste individuals with the talents that Gibb Madsen has displayed for so many years.●

REVISIONS NEEDED IN TIP REPORTING LAW

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, together with my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. JACOBS, of Indiana, a bill to address the many problems that have arisen under the 1982 tip reporting law. We are joined also in this effort by Mr. DICKINSON, of Alabama and Mr. TAYLOR, of Missouri. Restaurant owners, operators, and employees in our congressional districts and across

the country are rightfully concerned over the tremendous burden placed upon them by the recently enacted reporting requirements on restaurant employee tip income.

No hearings on this issue were held last year, and the House did not have a chance to review the matter before voting on the final package included in the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act. Members of the Ways and Means Committee have a responsibility to scrutinize the statute, its purpose and its effect on the restaurant industry. The introduction of this legislation will provide the opportunity to do so.

The bill seeks to modify certain burdensome and unfair provisions contained in TEFRA with respect to taxpayer compliance and the unprecedented methods through which tax liability is to be determined. We are speaking about the process of requiring a third party to allocate income to an individual—income that may or may not have been received by that individual. This is an entirely new concept of enforcement unsupported by the rest of the Tax Code or by any other provision of law. Yet this situation exists currently for restaurants, and its implications reach far beyond the restaurant industry.

The concept of allocation should be addressed by the House before it is extended to other groups of taxpayers. We urge our colleagues to seriously consider this issue during the August recess.●

THE 207TH ANNIVERSARY OF READING OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 8, 1776, the Declaration of Independence was read publicly for the first time to the citizens of Philadelphia. On July 8, 1983, Andrew A. Frederick of Philadelphia delivered remarks on the occasion of the 207th anniversary of the public reading of the Declaration of Independence. Mr. Frederick who lives in my congressional district is a park ranger at Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia. I want to share his remarks with my colleagues.

REMARKS OF ANDREW A. FREDERICK

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. On behalf of the National Park Service and myself, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome you to Independence National Historical Park. We are gathered here to commemorate the 207th anniversary of when the Declaration of Independence was publicly proclaimed for the first time to the people right on this square. It had been on the previous Thursday, July 4th, 1776 that this document was officially adopted by the Members of the Second Continental Congress. However, this is not the only day connected with the declaration. An order had also been issued on that day for the printing, publishing and for a public proclamation of it. On this day, Monday, July 8th, 1776 the Pennsylvania Committee of Safety issued instructions that the declaration would be read to the citizens of this city.

A platform was already standing in this area, which had been erected in 1769 by the American Philosophical Society for Astronomical Observations, and a member of the committee of safety, Colonel John Nixon, was given the honor of reading the declaration from it. According to John Adams, who had served on the Declaration Committee in Congress, a great crowd of people has assembled, though described by some as not being of the best class of citizen, and stood approximately where you are now. In a clear and resonant voice, heard even on Fifth Street, Colonel Nixon began to read the document on that warm, sunny day. A local Philadelphia girl, Deborah Norris Logan, wrote in her diary "that it was a time of fearful doubt and great anxiety; many were appalled at the boldness of the measure." When you hear these words of independence and liberty in a few minutes, think of how you might have felt on this day in 1776. Would your own reaction have been one of great enthusiasm, which I encourage you to show durin: this reading, or one of somewhat shock?

Following that original reading, there were demonstrations of great joy throughout the city. There were bonfires, ringing of the city's many bells including that of the statehouse and the chimes of Christ Church, and military salutes from the city's garrision. Militia members of the committee of safety were commissioned with the patriotic task of removing the symbol of Britrish authority in Philadelphia, the King's coat of arms in the court chamber of the statehouse. The royal arms were torn from the court chamber's wall and carried to the city's common, where our city hall now stands at Broad Street, and burned in one of the celebrating bonfires thus symbolically marking the end of Britain's rule in America. Our independence was now formally proclaimed to the world, but it would take seven long years of warfare and sacrifice for this freedom to be earned.

We hope that you will enjoy our commenoration ceremony and reflect on what will be said. Thank you.●

A LOCAL ANGLE TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT STORY

HON. MICKEY EDWARDS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with this Congress what those of us who have been in the news business call the local angle to a national story.

The story is unemployment and it has dominated the national news for what now seems like ages. It also, of course, has been a prevailing concern of all of us here who have widely divergent views on the issue of how to restore our country's economic health.

That is the national story, one of statistics percentages, economic indicators; but I want to fill in the missing ingredient in this story—the people behind those numbers. I want to localize this story by telling you what has dominated the front pages of the newspaper in one of the towns in my district in Oklahoma.

This is not a story of more Government spending. In fact, it is not, by the very adamant choice of those involved, a story of any Federal involvement whatsoever.

This is a story of pride, community spirit, volunteerism, self-help, and guts.

The current year has been a hard one for Blackwell, Okla., population 8,400. Although there are now the beginnings of employee recalls, the local foundry and other industries have had massive layoffs this year. The local paper, the Blackwell Journal-Tribune, with a wary eye of the national statistics, decided to do its survey, and found that the unemployment rate in the Blackwell work force had reached 47 percent.

Half of the work force idled—that is not a statistic for the faint of heart. But the people of this small community in Oklahoma set out to do something about the problem.

When Dale McGaha, the editor of the Blackwell Journal-Tribune, published the results of his poll on the town's unemployment, the chamber of commerce, the churches, concerned citizens, and, most important, the unemployed themselves, formed a coalition and telescoped their efforts into a singular goal of matching available jobs with available workers.

Initially the meetings started as coffees at a local ministry facility named "Contact Point," with the support, advice and encouragement of Sister Marie Bernard. Says Sister Marie, "The unemployed have lost more than their paycheck; they have lost their self-esteem, and just getting together with others who are unemployed reminds them it happened through no fault of their own." Besides helping the unemployed, Sister Marie also opens Contact Point to "feed the poor, clothe the naked and put all who need help in touch with an appropriate agency," as she puts it. "We don't try to duplicate Government services," she points out, "but local communities can pick up the slack, and must."

Out of the meetings on unemployment at Sister Marie's Contact Point came an organization with elected officers, a plan, and even a bank account for contributions.

The group first sought to find out what skills were available in the community's work force and for several days in May the newspaper ran, on page 1 so it couldn't be missed, a clip-and-mail job skill survey form. In es-

sence, the form provided a fill-in-the-blank resumé for anyone seeking a job. The local paper also provided the unemployed free classified advertising space to sell their skills to potential employers. And just in case an unemployed person might overlook this service, the newspaper also ran half-page ads urging subscribers to clip the job skill survey and free classified forms and "hand them to one of your unemployed friends."

The local chamber put up a new employment bulletin board where both the unemployed and potential employers can come to match index cards. Also a retired businessman came out of retirement to offer job counseling to the unemployed. Local business were urged to post the job skill survey form in their front windows.

The unemployed, themselves, set up and manned a full-time calling and referral service. And when they were not busy with this or with job search efforts, they volunteered their time to help with community projects.

In order to expand the potential job market, the contact point group contacted other communities in Kay County and surrounding areas to find industries looking for workers.

Two months after the kickoff of this program for the unemployed, the group is beginning to tell success stories. Jobs are being matched with workers, and even temporary work has been found for some as area farmers have called in looking for help with harvesting. As Sister Marie put it, "We keep losing the officers of our unemployment club, because they find jobs. But the nice thing is, they hang around to help the others."

Now here is the best part of this story. This idea for solving unemployment is spreading. The Blackwell group proudly reports that nearby Ponca City, a city five times as big, has now developed a program modeled after the one in Blackwell.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this idea catches fire and spreads all the way east to the Potomac. I hope this local story becomes the national story on unemployment.●

GUAM GOVERNOR BORDALLO WINS APPROVAL OF PERTINENT RESOLUTIONS AFFECTING GUAM IN WESTERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

HON. ANTONIO B. WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of our colleagues to the adoption of the Western Governors' Conference of important resolutions introduced there by Guam Gov. Ricardo Bordallo.

The members of the conference, which was held in Kalispell, Mont. in June of this year, honored our Governor by voting to endorse these resolutions and in doing so placed the conference firmly behind his own drive to improve the economic and political future of Guam.

As a fellow Guamanian and a close friend of the Governor, I applaud his success. His efforts with the Western Governor's Conference opens important new avenues of support for the territory as it seeks to define ways in which the people of Guam can develop our potential while also improving our status within the context of the American political system.

Governor Bordallo recognizes that a goal of such immense scope and scale cannot be achieved alone. As an activist Governor, he has set out to win the endorsement of his fellow Governors who often recognize that there is a strong similarity in the problems Guam faces with the Federal Government and the problems the various States have in their relations with Washington. Justice for Guam could well create a new atmosphere of cooperation which could benefit the States. And I am pleased that Governor Bordallo has obviously been able to carry this message successfully to his colleagues at the Western Governors' Conference.

The topics discussed in Governor Bordallo's resolutions are: Relationship between the Territory of Guam and the Federal Government (Res. 83-20); Opposition to the Present Policy on Disposition of Surplus Federal Land (Res. 83-10); International Financing Activity in the U.S. Territories (Res. 83-19).

It is obvious from the wide scope of these resolutions that Governor Bordallo is working on many fronts to improve the future of the island. I share his concerns and am working with him in Congress and within the administration to see that these goals are attained.

The Subcommittee on Insular Affairs, which I chair, is already taking a close look at legislation I have introduced calling for the establishiment of a Commission to work with the local leaders from Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa to review how various Federal laws impact on these regions. I am particualry proud that the Governor was successsful in gaining the support of the Western Governor's Council for my bill, House Concurrent Resolution 131, which urges the President to appoint representatives to discuss Federal-territorial relations for Guam. And only several months ago, at the request of my subcommittee, the Library of Congress held the first symposium on energy needs of the territories.

I am proud to be working closely with Governor Bordallo on behalf of our island and I look forward to a continued and close relationship with him as we move to improve the quality of life on Guam. At this time I request that the resolutions introduced by Governor Bordallo now be inserted in the RECORD so that my colleagues here can review their contents.

APPROVED RESOLUTION NO. 83-19—INTERNATIONAL FINANCING ACTIVITY IN THE U.S. TERRITORY OF GUAM

(Introduced by Governor Ricardo Bordallo, Guam)

Whereas, in 1972, the U.S. Congress added Section 881(b) to the Internal Revenue Code to remove the 30 percent withholding requirement on interest paid to U.S. investors from Guam sources; and

Whereas, the stated purpose of the addition of Section 881(b) to the Internal Revenue Code was to remove a major disincentive to Guam investment from mainland sources; and

Whereas, in December 1982, the Department of the Treasury issued regulations (T.D. 7864 and Revenue Ruling 83-9) that rendered Section 881(b) of the Internal Revenue Code ineffective for the purpose of encouraging international financing activity on Guam; and

Whereas, both the Solicitor General of the Department of the Interior and the American Bar Association's Tax Section have supported Guam's position that the regulations in question went beyond the Department of the Treasury's authority and preempted the power of Congress to make tax law and the power of the Governor of Guam under the Organic Act of Guam, as amended, to administer and regulate the Territorial Income Tax; and

Whereas, it is the stated goal of the Government of Guam to lessen that island's economic dependence on government subsidies by developing the private sector economy in those areas especially appropriate to an insular economy through a program of economic rearmament; now, therefore, be it,

Resolved, That the Western Governor's Conference supports the Territory of Guam's position on international financing activity and urges the Secretary of the Treasury to work closely with territorial leaders in overcoming any policy objections he may have to such activity.

Approved by the Western Governors' Conference on June 29, 1983, in Kalispell, Montana. (WGC14R8319.)

APPROVED RESOLUTION NO. 83-10*—OPPOSITION TO THE PRESENT POLICY ON DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS FEDERAL LANDS

(Introduced by Governor Richardo Bordallo, Guam; Governor George Ariyoshi, Hawaii; and Governor John Evans, Idaho)

Whereas, Western Governors' Conference Resolution No. 82-7 requests that the disposal of surplus federal real property be accomplished in the best interests of the affected state and with the review and concurrence of state and local governments affected; and

Whereas, meeting the best interests of state and local governments is to make an important contribution to the well-being of the nation; and

Whereas, Executive Order No. 12348, promulgated on March 1, 1982, established a

* Governor Allen Olson, North Dakota, indicating that this resolution does not accurately reflect his views.

federal Property Review Board to screen all future sales and transfers of federal land and established a policy discouraging the transfer of surplus federal land to nonprofit and public agencies at public benefit discount; and

Whereas, this change in policy has both jeopardized long-standing cooperative relationships between federal agencies, and state and local governments, and diminished the states' abilities to site public facilities; and

Whereas, the stated policy established by Executive Order No. 12348 is to sell surplus federal land to the highest bidder to reduce the national debt; and

Whereas, the concept of the federal government selling its land assets, of forfeiting the ability of future generations to use such land for public purposes, to pay for a small portion of the federal government's operating expenses for a few years is ill-advised; and

Whereas, most of our economies and many of our lifestyles in the West are dependent upon and tied to public lands and national forests; and

Whereas, severe disruption of many of our important businesses such as mining, logging, ranging and tourism could ensue if the Property Review Board was to proceed in accordance with Executive Order 12348; and

Whereas, public access to areas of traditional use could be limited if the land were to become private property and thus limit such activities as grazing or hunting; and

Whereas, land in all U.S. Flag Territories in the Pacific is an extremely precious commodity with incalculable intrinsic and traditonal worth to the indigenous people of those insular areas that cannot be measured in terms of fair market value; now, therefore, be it

Resolved By the Western Governors' Conference that:

1. The Conference strongly recommends that the President reverse this sales policy which is harmful to the overall public good and restore the practice in effect since World War II of giving strong consideration to the various states' needs of public lands in conformance with stated Congressional policy;

2. The Conference re-emphasizes its policy position stated in Resolution No. 82-7 and extends that position to cover all land held by the federal government in any of the U.S. Flag Territories of the Pacific;

3. In such disposal decisions, Western State, local, insular and territorial governments be given a direct opportunity to review and concur with disposal of federal real properties within their direct jurisdictions and that the planning, coordination, and consultation requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-579) be fully adhered to prior to the offering for sale or otherwise conveying public land or national forest tracts;

4. The opportunity for state, local, insular and territorial governments to obtain surplus federal property for public purposes through no cost or low cost conveyances be continued with such applications processed in an expedited fashion and *not* subject to review by the federal Property Review Board;

5. Western States and U.S. Flag Territories in the Pacific be given the opportunity to assume ownership of public lands and national forest tracts which are better suited for state, local or territorial management;

6. The federal Property Review Board be immediately directed to reveal the identity and location of federal properties which are candidates for disposal in the Western States and the U.S. Flag Territories in the Pacific;

7. The federal Property Review Board be immediately directed to establish formal procedures for state, territorial and local government involvement, consultation and concurrence; and

8. The Western Governors' Conference supports the action taken by the U.S. House Appropriations Committee, reported on June 21, 1983, to eliminate funding for the Bureau of Land Management's public land disposal program.

Approved by the Western Governors' Conference on June 29, 1983, in Kalispell, Mon. (WGC14R8310.)

APPROVED RESOLUTION NO. 83-20—RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TERRITORY OF GUAM AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Introduced by Gov. Ricardo Bordallo, Guam)

Whereas, it is a basic principle of American democracy that the sovereignty of a government is derived from a consensus of the People governed through the process of self-determination; and

Whereas, the People of Guam have exercised their right of self-determination and expressed their desire to improve their status within the federal structure as evidenced through plebiscites in January and September 1982 in which a majority of the electorate chose a commonwealth status; and

Whereas, previous administrations, beginning in March of 1974, have supported the territories' rights of self-determination and have consistently indicated their willingness to discuss certain territorial relationships with leaders of the territories; and

Whereas, the United States Congress, by authority of Article IV, Section 3, of the U.S. Constitution, has plenary power over the territories of the United States; and

Whereas, Article IX of the Treaty of Paris of December 10, 1898, in which Spain ceded Guam to the United States, declares, "The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the Congress;" and

Whereas, on May 25, 1983, House Concurrent Resolution 131 was introduced to the U.S. House of Representatives, "Urging the President of the United States and the Governor of Guam to appoint representatives to discuss federal-territorial relations and to review the applicability of certain federal laws and their impact on the Territory of Guam;" Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Western Governors' Conference urges the President of the United States and the Governor of Guam to appoint representatives to discuss federal-territorial relations; and

Be it further resolved that the Conference urges the Congressional delegations of the Western States to support House Concurrent Resolution 131.

Approved by the Western Governors' Conference on June 29, 1983, in Kalispell, Mont. (WGC14R8320.)●

SMALL BUSINESS INVENTORY SIMPLIFICATION

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to correct a serious tax problem facing many small businesses as a result of a decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1979, the so-called Thor Power decision. I do not quarrel with the Court's decision. The Court was simply enforcing the law. It is the law that is flawed: It does not reflect the reality or sense of actual business practice.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the Court held that if a taxpayer continues to hold excess or obsolete inventory in the chance that a customer might need it in later years to keep an old piece of machinery operating, for example, then the businessman must value that inventory for tax purposes at his cost or its sales prices.

But suppose that a manufacturer or dealer stocks many parts, rather than sell them for salvage, in order to better serve his customers. After a period of time, the chances that someone will buy a part from this obsolete inventory is remote; and, yet, if the businessman does not maintain this stock of old parts, a customer might be forced to dispose of a perfectly good piece of equipment for want of a part that is no longer obtainable.

Now, if the dealer does maintain a stock of outdated parts, it can hardly be said that the entire inventory is worth its initial cost. But the law is such that the businessman cannot devalue these items in accordance with actual business experience.

The bill I am introducing today attempts to correct this anomaly. It allows for a write-down of obsolete inventory. It also contains safety features to prevent abuses by eliminating the potential for fluctuating inventory deductions for tax purposes.

Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the Court's decision, both the taxpaying small businesses and IRS auditors are uncertain about how to proceed. In effect, small business people have been put on "hold." Yet, these taxpayers face the prospect of being "hit" retroactively with a large unanticipated tax bill.

America's small business entrepreneurs deserve better than to be placed on "hold" while waiting for the "hit." Moreover, in the 1981 Tax Act, which gave so much to the largest corporations in America, Congress mandated that the Treasury conduct a full and complete study of small business methods of accounting and inventory with a view toward the development of simplified methods. Treasury has not

fulfilled this vital obligation. It is high time to get them off the dime.●

POWELL A. MOORE RETIRES

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the retirement of a distinguished public servant, Powell A. More, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations. Anyone who has to serve in a department bureau with the responsibility for congressional liaison must have the personal qualities of patience, tact, thoroughness, and energy. Powell Moore demonstrated all those qualities—and more.

His service with the Reagan administration will be sorely missed by all those who knew him and worked with him. As he begins his retirement, I simply wish to congratulate him for a job well done and say "good luck and Godspeed."

Before assuming the position of Assistant Secretary of State, Powell Moore was Deputy Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs and was in charge of White House relations with the U.S. Senate.

Prior to joining the White House staff, Mr. Moore had been engaged for the previous 6 years in governmental relations and Washington representation, as a consultant for a variety of corporations and associations.

He began his Washington career in 1966 as an aide to the late Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia. When Senator Russell died in 1971, he became Deputy Director of Public Information for the U.S. Department of Justice and later served in the Office of Legislative Affairs at the White House under Presidents Nixon and Ford. When he left the White House staff to enter private business in 1975, he was a Deputy Special Assistant to the President.

Mr. Moore worked on the national Presidential campaign staff of President Nixon in 1972, of President Ford in 1976, and of President Reagan in 1980. His association with the Reagan campaign began in early 1979 and he was assistant director of congressional relations for the Reagan transition between election day in 1980 and the inauguration on January 20, 1981.

Mr. Moore graduated from the Henry Grady School of Journalism at the University of Georgia in Athens, Ga., in 1959. He is a former weekly newspaper editor in Georgia and served for 3½ years as a U.S. Army officer including a tour in West Germany. Born on January 5, 1938, in Milledgeville, Ga., Mr. Moore is married to the former Miss Katherine Southward of Midway City, Calif. They have two children.●

SURVEY OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the recent report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, "A Nation at Risk," has received a great deal of attention in the past few weeks from those interested in education, and its recommendations for reform have already been widely studied and debated. In some quarters, unfortunately, those valuable recommendations have been largely misunderstood or ignored—most notably, in the White House.

President Reagan has proposed, in the guise of educational reform, such "solutions" as the drastic reduction of Federal funding for education and the dismantling of the Department of Education. He has, moreover, sought to lend weight to his latest proposals by suggesting that no less an authority than the National Commission on Excellence in Education had recommended such actions.

I decided to survey the members of the National Commission directly on just that point: Whether the President's proposals for education were anywhere suggested or endorsed by the Commission's report. In short, the answer is an emphatic "no." The Commissioners do not support reductions in Federal assistance for education.

The Commissioners were first asked whether the "Nation at Risk" report concluded that additional Federal funds should be provided for education and 8 of the 10 who answered the survey responded that, contrary to the President's belief that Federal funding should be dramatically cut, the report foresees a definite and significant role for Federal funding in education. The Commissioners were unanimous in the belief that increased State and local funds would be necessary as well, for improving American education.

The Federal Government has taken an active and important interest in the support and encouragement of education throughout the history of our country. The National Commission's report itself speaks of the "sound tradition, from the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 until today, that the Federal Government should supplement State, local, and other resources to foster key national education goals."

And yet we have a President determined to reverse that tradition, at the very moment that a rededication to the needs of education is most urgently required. In the last 2 years over $2.5 billion has been cut from Federal education support. And more appalling still, by 1988, under the President's budget proposals, Federal funding for education in constant dollars would be reduced to a level beneath the amount spent in 1967. Such budget cuts are hardly responsible when the need for educational improvement is imperative.

A 1982 Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the Nation's schools showed that a majority of those surveyed felt that public education should hold the top priority for additional Federal funds, ahead of every other category listed, including the military. Mr. Speaker, if the President will not listen to his own National Commission on Excellence in Education—and it is obvious that he has not—he at least should listen to the American people.●

INVESTIGATIVE RECORDS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON AGING

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Several weeks ago the House of Representatives debated and passed a privileged resolution relating to the investigative records of the Select Committee on Aging, which I had the honor to chair until the commencement of the 98th Congress. During consideration of House Resolution 176, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber, attending to a previously scheduled meeting of the Interparliamentary Union. I want to commend the leadership on both sides of the aisle for bringing this resolution to the floor, as well as Chairman ROYBAL and ranking Republican RINALDO, and had I been here I would have supported the resolution, which passed with an overwhelming vote of 386 yeas to 22 nays.

Because of the crucial importance of the resolution to the independence of the legislative branch and its ability to conduct effective investigations into matters affecting the welfare of our people, I wanted to share with the Members and others some background into the investigation which we conducted concerning supplemental health insurance to the elderly and its results, particularly since the investigation was conducted in 1978, perhaps before some current Members were elected to the House.

The select committee had received information from senior citizens that supplemental health insurance was being sold to the elderly through the use of sales practices that preyed on

their fears and vulnerabilities, through scare tactics and heavy handed techniques, and that in many instances, insurance was sold needlessly and in duplication of existing coverage. Reports of these abuses had also appeared in the media.

After a survey of the subject through traditional means, including questionnaires to State insurance commissioners, carriers, and Federal authorities, the staff determined that it would be necessary, in order to learn the nature and extent of these sales practices, to conduct a field investigation through which first-hand observation of these techniques could be acquired. We determined to use a method we had used on previous occasions with success to acquire accurate first-hand information—utilizing committee personnel to obtain sales positions with companies selling supplemental policies and to arrange sales meetings at which agents would offer and discuss their policies, often to senior citizens employed by the select committee for this purpose. Indeed, the staff suggested that I attend one or more of these sales meetings to appreciate the scope of the problem, but it was determined that I might be too recognizable and jeopardize the efficacy of the investigation. Congressman MARIO BIAGGI did participate in several such meetings, posing as a pensioner interested in supplemental insurance, and later reported to the committee on his experiences.

I can tell Members of the House that in my experience at the select committee, and earlier as chairman of the Select Committee on Crime, that those engaged in the kinds of abusive sales practices which we documented do not volunteer to come before the Congress, under the glare of public scrutiny, and describe in detail the unscrupulous and unethical pursuit of the elderly for profit. And so we in the select committee, members and staff, went undercover to develop a full, painstaking, and accurate record of abusive sales practices and to lay before the Congress and the American people what we found.

We offered no inducements whatsoever to any agent or company during our investigation, but simply provided an opportunity for those engaged in unscrupulous activity to promote the insurance products in their customary manner; we simply developed a more complete record of the practices we observed than could be obtained by recalling what had occurred at these sales meetings later. We did not tell any agent or insurance carrier what to say, how to act or when to make a sale; we simply pinned down the facts for review by our committee and the Congress. We wanted very much that the elderly of the Nation be aware of the results of our investigation, so that they could protect themselves, but also to appreciate and understand the impetus behind the legislation which was ultimately enacted to provide a modicum of prevention against abusive practices.

As I stated at the select committee hearing on November 28, 1978, we on the committee were anxious for the story of these abuses to become common knowledge among the people of this Nation who are concerned with the plight of the elderly citizens of this country who were, and sadly still are, being victimized by these unscrupulous sales practices. Therefore I, as chairman of the select committee, gave our staff, particularly our senior committee aides, the discretion to work with the media to bring our message to the citizens of this Nation, as I have done on other occasions.

Mr. Speaker, your Select Committee on Aging has worked vigorously to protect the welfare of our senior citizens. It is important that practices which are abusive, initimidate, or threaten the welfare of our senior citizens be brought to light, and for our elderly to be forewarned and protected against unethical sales practices. I felt then and feel now that our committee, and its staff, did a commendable job in documenting this problem and bringing it to the attention of the Congress and the Nation.

Now, I understand that during the debate on House Resolution 176, questions were raised about the methodology employed by the select committee and its cooperation with ABC, a codefendant in the action. I can only suggest that the proof is in the pudding and the solid record established by the select committee, which resulted in the passage of laws making some of the abusive practices illegal, could only have been achieved in the manner described.

I take this opportunity to commend the House on the action it has taken and the Speaker and bipartisan leadership of the House.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES McCLURE CLARKE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, on July 29, 1983, I was necessarily absent from the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives for the last vote of the day. Had I been present for rollcall No. 296, agreeing to House Concurrent Resolution 153, providing for the August adjournment of the House and Senate, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having this opportunity to make my position known for the RECORD.●

HISPANIC AMERICAN VIEW CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. EVANS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with U.S. military exercises imminent in Central America, it is time for all Americans to reflect on the wisdom of the Reagan administration's policies in that region. We should pay particular attention to the views of our Hispanic Americans, many of whom are rightly concerned about possible U.S. involvement in an armed conflict in Central America.

Following is a powerful column from a recent edition of U.S.A. Today by Arnoldo S. Torres, executive director of the League of United Latin American Citizens:

WILL HISPANICS FIGHT HISPANICS?

(By Arnoldo S. Torres)

WASHINGTON.—Hispanic-Americans are more concerned than ever about Central America. Many believe that the cultural insensitivity and ignorance of U.S. policy is related to a misunderstanding of and insensitivity toward Hispanic-Americans.

Continued references to Central America as "our backyard" are an example of a paternalistic, crisis-oriented mentality. The United States has historically neglected and disregarded Central America; that cannot be rectified simply by throwing money into wars.

That mentality is reflected in Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick's suggestion that a "Marshall Plan" is needed to thwart Soviet-backed "subversion" in Central America. That puts the problems of Latin America solely in a U.S.-Soviet context.

It's indeed unfortunate that such a Latin American "expert" should think of cultural exchange and development aid only in terms of a response to Cuban literacy programs and Soviet-supported fellowships.

For many Latins, the choice of Henry Kissinger to head the policy commission adds insult to injury. The commission suffers from the same problems as U.S. foreign policy in this region—lack of knowledge, experience and sensitivity.

The result of present policy seems inevitable: The administration is seeking a military solution in Central America that would have Hispanic Americans in U.S. armed forces fighting in disproportionate numbers against our Latin brothers.

Hispanic Americans would be the first on the front lines to carry out this unrealistic and mistaken policy. And in view of the paranoia about undocumented workers, it is possible that under war conditions we could hear in the United States calls from the far right for internment camps for "Latin communists."

It is the obligation of United States decision makers to see that international law and our own laws are obeyed, that peaceful coexistence with our Southern neighbors is maintained and that the lives of American citizens are protected. Continued failure to meet this obligation could mean war.

Despite the loss of 45,000 lives in the region and a growing human tragedy, no policy changes are in sight. Is it un-Ameri-

can to question or criticize this insane policy? I certainly hope not.●

A CAREER OF IDEAS

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, there are few people in today's world who can boast of a career spanning nearly half a century. Experience, in today's world, generally consists of 6 months on the job, or perhaps 2 years of graduate work. Last week, Tom Fesperman graduated from a career spanning 48 years.

Tom's profession was journalism, but his real expertise was in the field of ideas. Starting as a reporter on the Charlotte, N.C., News, he was in succession a daily columnist, city editor, managing editor, and editor at various papers; most recently, he was editorial page editor at the Santa Barbara, Calif., News-Press, a Pulitzer-prize winning publication in the district I have the honor to represent.

Along the way, Tom also managed to serve in the Army during World War II, write a thrice-weekly syndicated column for NEA, serve as a director of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association, a lecturer at the American Press Institute, and a writing coach. You might say he was immersed in the business—and you would be correct.

Tom's acumen, his vast wealth of experience, and his acquaintance with the major ideas and trends of his time served his readers as well as himself. In a career that saw journalism transformed from hot type to video display terminals, Tom never lost sight of the human dimension of the news. And although he is now enjoying a more leisurely pace, he has agreed to remain an occasional contributor to the flow of ideas, enriching us all.

I am pleased to extend the felicitations of this body and my constituents—also Tom's—on this occasion, and our best wishes for a continued rich and varied life.●

EMINENT DOMAIN: HOW IT WORKS

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the House is going to soon have an opportunity to once again vote on coal slurry legislation. Prior to that vote, there will doubtless be a great deal of discussion surrounding the issue of granting Federal eminent domain authority to coal pipelines. I want to contribute to this discussion by reminding my colleagues about some facts about how pipelines generally exercise the power of Federal eminent domain and then address the specific eminent domain provisions of H.R. 1010, the proposed Coal Pipeline Act of 1983.

It should be noted at the outset that the exercise of Federal eminent domain authority by a private corporation is not unique. It has exercised at various times by oil and gas pipelines, railroads, canals, and electric transmission lines for utilities. This power carries with it clearly prescribed duties and responsibilities. In order to better understand how an eminent domain proceeding will work for coal pipelines, I have outlined below the steps in a typical Federal eminent domain proceeding under the Natural Gas Act. The proceedings will be very much the same under both the Natural Gas Act and the provisions of H.R. 1010.

Initially, contact is made with the landowner by representatives of the pipeline requesting permission to enter upon the land to survey a route for the proposed project. At this time a dialog is begun with the landowner regarding the general direction of the proposed route and an explanation of the project in as much detail as possible. The landowner's considerations and requests are duly noted for consideration as part of future negotiations.

Once a route has been selected, representatives of the pipeline company negotiate with the landowner for an easement granting rights to enter his land and construct, operate, and maintain the proposed facility. At such time as the landowner conveys these specific rights to the corporation he is paid a sum of money as consideration for the easement based on an estimate of the value of his lands and which sum may include payment for all normal construction damages in advance. The landowner retains title to the land above the pipeline right-of-way.

The pipeline company must tender compensation to a landowner before the corporation has the right to enter upon that person's land in order to proceed with the project. Should the tender be refused by the landowner, it must be deposited with the courts prior to entry upon the lands for project purposes. The tender is generally in some multiple of the estimated amount of damages and appraised value. The money or bond so deposited is available for the landowner usually during the time of litigation, or at such time as the final jurisdiction and decision is made by the courts.

The pipeline has the responsibility and the legal obligation to act in a responsible manner. The company must perform under the terms of the legal document it has executed with the landowner or obtained through the courts. A corporation must restrict its operations to the rights within the area for which it has acquired. If it is negligent or fails to comply with the terms of the easement or judgment the landowner has a document through which he can obtain legal recourse against the corporation. The company, through the legal contract, is responsible for the payment for all vegetation, crops, and improvements that are destroyed, altered, or impaired as a result of construction and will compensate the landowner for them. Land is restored as nearly as practicable to its preexisting condition. It is in both the pipeline's and landowner's interest that vegetation be reestablished either through cultivation or other means in order to protect the right-of-way from erosion.

Once the pipeline has been constructed the legal contract—easement, judgment—provides the right to enter upon the land to maintain and operate facilities.

Again, the contract also provides certain rights to the landowner under which he must be compensated for those damages which incur to growing crops, vegetation, fences, or other permitted improvements along the right-of-way or to his property as a result of operations or maintenance.

Generally, easements are of a perpetual nature and will remain with the corporation for its purposes in perpetuity. There are occasions where easements are accepted which provide that in the event that the corporation ceases to use the rights obtained for a specific period of time those rights will revert back to the current owner of the land. Any land that is acquired under a fee purchase for long-term facilities—for example pumping stations—will remain the property of the corporation and can only be disposed of by sale or other similar methods.

It should be noted that the power of Federal eminent domain granted to coal pipelines in H.R. 1010 imposes several duties on the pipeline company and additional protections to landowners. Specifically, H.R. 1010 would:

Require that the power of Federal eminent domain be exercised in appropriate State courts in such manner as may be provided for under applicable State law.

Require that State law dealing with compensation, trial by jury and citing alternatives will apply except where if such law would prohibit acquisition of a right-of-way. If State law does not provide for or permit trials by jury, an affected landowner shall have that right nonetheless.

Prohibit the use of eminent domain authority by a pipeline company unless they are unable to acquire the necessary right-of-way by negotiation within a reasonable period of time.

Require payment for reasonable attorney fees to a landowner by the pipeline company if the offer for the easement/land is not at least 80 percent of the value of the land as determined by the court in a condemnation suit. The limit for such fees is $20,000, except that they can be higher if there is a showing of bad faith on the part of the pipeline.

Require pipelines to be built underground to the maximum extent practical. The pipeline shall be installed in such a way as to minimize interference with agricultural drainage systems. Upon completion of the pipeline, the pipeline company shall replace topsoil and revegetate the land, and restore the land to its preconstruction condition and use to the extent possible.

These additional protections afforded landowners in H.R. 1010 were adopted with the support of the coal industry. I think it is clear that H.R. 1010 makes every effort to balance the needs of coal pipeline operators and landowners. This is a needed piece of legislation which I would urge my colleagues to support.●

PIK PROGRAM

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues two articles that appeared yesterday in the Washington Post. I would particularly recommend these articles to any Member whose district includes farming communities.

In a time when the farmers in my district of west Texas are facing near financial ruin because of a fourth consecutive year of declining net farm income, 6 months without even an inch of rain, and an administration whose answer to these problems is to slash target price support levels in the immediate future, it is interesting to read that some of the chief beneficiaries of the administration's payment-in-kind program are those people who are charged with the creation and supervision of that same program.

Everett G. Rank, Chief Administrator of the PIK program and head of the USDA's Stabilization and Conservation Services, is one of five partners of a farm operation that will receive 1.3 million pounds of cotton free, worth over $1 million on the open market. It further turns out that big agribusiness concerns, owned in some cases by Chevron, Shell, and Superior Oil Cos., are the main beneficiaries of this year's PIK program.

I find it appalling that a farm program put into place to help the small and family-operated farming concern is, in actuality, benefiting those agribusiness interests that need the least amount of help.

I find it indefensible that the chief architect of this same program stands to realize a substantial amount of money from participation in this program by his business interests.

I would hope that my colleagues feel as outraged as I do to learn that once again, the "primary constituents" of this administration, big business, are reaping the fruits of an agriculture policy put into place to help those farmers who are facing depressionlike conditions and barely scratching out a subsistence level of income.

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 1983]

CONGLOMERATES TO REAP MILLIONS FROM PIK

(By Ward Sinclair)

FRESNO, CALIF.—Dozens of big farms in the San Joaquin Valley, some owned by such conglomerates as Bangor Punta, Tenneco, Chevron USA, Shell Oil and Superior Oil, will receive millions of dollars worth of free cotton through the Reagan administration's payment-in-kind (PIK) program.

In Fresno, Kings, Kern and Tulare counties, nearly 50 farms will receive cotton worth $1 million or more each, according to Department of Agriculture records at county offices of the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service. They also show that dozens of smaller farms in the four counties will receive free cotton worth more than $500,000 through the federal program.

Among the beneficiaries is Everett G. (Bud) Rank Jr., chief administrator of the PIK program and head of the Agriculture Department's Stabilization and Conservation Service since 1981. He and four partners in a Fresno County operation, Cinco Farms, will receive 1.3 million pounds of cotton, worth slightly more than $1 million, in return for idling their entire cotton base of 2,163 acres.

The PIK program will give farmers amounts of free cotton, wheat, corn and rice in return for not planting all or part of their 1983 crop. It is intended to reduce market-depressing surpluses and increase farm prices. Last year, net farm income, adjusted for inflation, hit its lowest mark since the Depression.

But PIK is coming under increasing fire in Congress and across the farm belt. Critics, charging that the program is too generous, estimate that it will cost taxpayers $12 billion or more and claim that it undermines farm-supply companies and

Rank, in a meeting with farmers here last week, touched on these issues. He said farm program costs are becoming "kind of embarrassing" and are "bleeding the taxpayer."

Rank said. "We can't expect the American taxpayer to keep subsidizing agriculture . . . The American taxpayer at some point is going to say 'that's enough'. . . . We farmers bitch about welfare and we all have our hands out. You have to realize the taxpayers are not going to guarantee your profit."

Willoughby Houk, a rancher near the community of Firebaugh who idled 91 acres and stands to get only 98 bales of free cotton, said, "The rich just got richer in this program. They never should have waived that $50,000 limit on federal payments to individual farmers."

As PIK was being designed late last year, Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block insisted the program would not work unless it was open to all farmers. He argued that it would not attract enough participants if a congressionally imposed limit of $50,000 on federal aid payments to individual farmers was left in place.

The Agricultural Department, which failed to win congressional authorization for the PIK with a waiver of the payment limitation, went ahead on its own. Government lawyers reasoned that the $50,000 limit would not apply because farmers would be given a commodity rather than cash.

That decision has turned out to be a boon for many of the country's largest grain and cotton farmers. In the four major cotton-growing counties of the San Joaquin Valley, 503,479 acres—two of every five eligible acres—have been enrolled in the program.

In this valley, where farmers traditionally have been harsh critics of federal agricultural support programs, yet have been quick to take advantage of them, there is an additional dimension to benefits, from Washington.

Federally subsidized irrigation water available to many farmers here at a fraction of its real cost has contributed to extraordinary cotton yields from a desert landscape that otherwise would produce little. Farmers from this area mounted a major lobbying effort to persuade Congress to retain their water subsidies in last year's revision of the Reclamation Act of 1902.

The large PIK payments to the valley's farmers are based on these high yields, which range between two and three bales per acre of high-demand, top-quality cotton, compared with one bale per acre for the typical dry-land farmer in the South and Southeast.

They also are getting another break in the PIK program. Because of the cost of irrigation water here, they have been exempted from the program's requirement to plant their idled fields with cover crops to prevent erosion.

The Agriculture Department also is permitting farmers here to use a "skip-row" cropping technique that will enhance yields further by alternating planted strips of land with idled strips, thus creating more "outside" rows that get more full sunlight. Some farmers in the valley also are being allowed to plant grapevines on idled land if they intend to give up cotton as a crop.

Some of the biggest recipients of PIK cotton here also cashed in handsomely in 1979 when the federal government paid millions of dollars in low-yield disaster payments to cotton farmers stricken by drought the previous year.

One such operation is South Lake Farms, owned by Producers Cotton Oil Co., a subsidiary of the Bangor Punta Corp., a Connecticut-based conglomerate that makes airplanes, boats, firearms, sporting goods and other industrial products. South Lake Farms, in Kings County, received $1 million in disaster aid in 1979. This year it will get at least 4,524,329 pounds of PIK cotton, worth about $3.6 million, according to the government records.

Producers Cotton Oil Co. President Gerald Brewer, who is also president of the National Cotton Council, refused to divulge details of his company's participation in PIK, although he said that the company has farms "in two or three counties." Producers Vice President Sid Cox refused to identify the counties or to name the farms, then hung up the telephone.

South Lake is only one of a number of conglomerate-owned farming operations

that will benefit from the cotton portion of PIK.

In Kern County, Belridge Farms, an affiliate of Shell Oil, is due to get 3.1 million pounds of cotton, worth about $2.5 million, plus 37,000 bushels of free federal wheat, worth about $150,000, through another part of the PIK program.

In Kern and Tulare counties, farming subsidiaries of Tenneco West, an arm of the Houston-based Tenneco oil and gas multinational, will get slightly more than 2 million pounds of cotton, with a current resale value of about $1.7 million.

Chevron USA, although not directly involved in farming, will cash in on PIK through its ownership of extensive agricultural land put into the program by farmers who operate on leases.

At least nine of these operations in Kern, Fresno and Kings counties will give Chevron more than 502,000 pounds of cotton, with a value of at least $401,000, as its share from the PIK program. Chevron also stands to get at least 2,346 bushels of PIK-program wheat from two of its Kern lease operations.

In Tulare County, the Superior Farming Co., a subsidiary of Superior Oil, will get 222,707 pounds of cotton through PIK, while the Standard Oil Co., operator of another farm, will receive 43,641 pounds of cotton.

Farmers in Fresno County, the richest agricultural county in the world, stand to get 73.2 million pounds of PIK cotton, with 26 of the growers receiving more than 1 million pounds each. Many of them are in the Westlands Water District, a 600,000-acre federally irrigated zone where farms of 1,000 acres and more with high yields are common.

Westlands farmers, represented by a phalanx of Washington and California lawyers, lobbied Congress to rewrite the 1902 reclamation law in ways that would protect their large holdings and their access to the cheap federal water.

Federal district and appellate courts had held that the 1902 law, limiting an individual to 160 acres of federally irrigated land and requiring owners to reside on the land, had been violated on a wholesale basis in Westlands. The 1982 revision of the law will increase water rates in Westlands, but it wiped out the tight restrictions on farm size and residency.

The biggest PIK recipients from Fresno County include Hillside Farms, owned by Steven H. Hall, and El Dorado Farms, operated by Yataro and Isamu Minami, with more than 4.6 million pounds of cotton each. Harris Farms, operated in Westlands by John Harris, will get 3.4 million pounds.

The largest individual PIK recipient in the valley apparently will be C. J. Ritchie Farms in Tulare County, which is scheduled to get 4,793,862 pounds with a market value of $3.8 million.

Don Jackson, who operates alone and in partnerships on about 25,000 acres in Kings and Tulare counties, according to government records, will get about 3.5 million pounds of cotton, which could be resold today for more than $2.8 million.

Jackson said in an interview that he had no qualms about accepting federal aid because he felt that federal farm policies were the root of his and other farmers' economic troubles.

"They're helping us out of something they got us into," Jackson said. "It is a salvation for farmers across the United States. There would be wholesale bankruptcies without it. * * * The government uses food as a big hammer over the markets. The whole concept of federal support levels is wrong. * * * If they kept their hands off, we would be okay."

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 1983]

TOP PIK OFFICIAL HAS FARM IN PROGRAM

(By Ward Sinclair)

Everett G. (Bud) Rank Jr., on leave from his California farm to work in the Reagan administration, will receive about $214,000 worth of free cotton from the federal payment-in-kind (PIK) program that he administers in the Agriculture Department, according to government records.

Rank is one of five partners in Cinco Farms, a Fresno County farming operation that is scheduled to receive 1,338,820 pounds of free surplus cotton through PIK. His share would be 267,764 pounds of cotton, which could be sold at today's prices for about 80 cents a pound, according to cotton handlers in Fresno, the center of San Joaquin Valley agriculture.

Rank said in an interview that he did not learn until last week that his farm had been enrolled in the PIK program and that he saw no conflict between that and his role as chief administrator of the PIK program.

But David Scott, chief counsel of the Office of Government Ethics at the Office of Personnel Management, said yesterday, "There clearly is a problem here. We will want to take a look into it, and will begin by contacting ethics people at USDA to take a look at this."

William J. Riley Jr., the Agriculture Department's director of personnel, said that he was not aware that Rank's farm was enrolled in PIK.

"Yes, of course, we will take a look at it," he said. "But I don't know if we would come to a different conclusion than Mr. Rank has."

Secretary of Agriculture John R. Block said that he also was unaware of Rank's enrollment in PIK, but he added that Rank had met federal requirements by giving up a directorship of the operation.

In contrast to Rank, Block has pledged that his own large farm operations in Illinois would not take part in federal farm aid programs, thus avoiding any real or apparent conflicts.

Block appointed Rank, a Republican, as national administrator of the Agriculture Department's Stabilization and Conservation Service shortly after the Reagan administration took office in 1981. Rank became chief of the PIK program when it was set up early this year to prop up farm prices and reduce crop surpluses.

Rank said that, to avoid conflicts of interest, he gave up his directorship of Cinco Farms when he came to Washington. He said that he was unable to sell his stock in the partnership when he came here and continues to receive rent from the farming operation in the huge Westlands Water District of the San Joaquin Valley.

Cinco Farms is headed by William McFarlane, a Fresno county grower who was president of a coalition of agribusiness interests that lobbied Congress heavily in 1981 and 1982 to retain federal irrigation subsidies in Westlands and in other western states.

Government records indicate that Cinco Farms enrolled its entire eligible base acreage of 2,163 acres in the PIK cotton program. Under terms of the federal surplus-reduction scheme, Cinco Farms is leaving that land idle this year and will receive 1.3 million pounds of surplus cotton for resale in the fall.●

INTERN PETITION TO END U.S. MILITARY AID TO CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues and the President of the United States the enclosed copy of a petition addressing the current situation in Central America which is being circulated by a large cohesive group of congressional interns and volunteers on their own time, and independent of any congressional sponsor. The purpose of this petition is to share with the Reagan administration their deep concern over increasing military involvement in Central America and urge the President to seek a peaceful negotiated settlement to the conflict.

Throughout the summer these interns and volunteers have used to their advantage the valuable informational resources available to them in order to form a more informed opinion on the current status of affairs in Central America. They have consulted staffs from both sides of the aisle in attempting to understand the policies of the administration. One of the valuable aspects of the internship/volunteer program is the participation in the process of policy analysis. While the signatures recognize this petition does not represent the views of all interns or volunteers, this concerned group wishes to make a statement expressing their opposition to the administration's actions in Central America.

This petition is being sent to President Reagan and to the Central American Embassies. I hope my colleagues and President Reagan will take this petition seriously. These students come from universities and colleges throughout the United States and will return to them continuing to take an active role in the policies which affect them. They do not have a constituency to represent nor an office to preserve, they have come to listen, learn, and form their own opinions. Therefore they can rightfully present their views undaunted by self-interest.

President Reagan:

During the past few years, the political instability in Central America has raised serious concerns in our country. We, the undersigned Congressional and Government Interns, wish to express our opposition to several of your Administration's actions in Central America:

(1) Increased U.S. military involvement;

(2) U.S. military support of governments that blatantly violate fundamental human rights;

(3) U.S. violation of national and international laws; and

(4) Continuing U.S. efforts to overthrow the Nicaraguan Government.

These actions are increasing the probability of direct U.S. troop involvement in a full-scale regional war.

We believe these actions stem partly from a misguided perception of events in Central America as little more than an outgrowth of the international competition between the United States and the Soviet Union. This overemphasis on the Soviet influence in Central America diverts attention from the history of political and economic oppression which is the principal cause of the current unrest. Moreover, your Administration's policy in Central America is consistent with your actions that increase the disparity of wealth between the rich and poor peoples in the world.

Believing that these policies can only undermine both the interests and ideals of the United states and that negotations provide the best means to the establishment of peace, democracy and justice in Central America, we therefore present the following petition:

Whereas, the Reagan Administration has violated the Boland Amendment, the Rio Treaty, the O.A.S. Charter, and the U.N. Charter by providing military assistance to groups attempting to overthrow the Nicaraguan Government; and

Whereas, in the past six months the political death toll in El Salvador has risen twelve percent over the previous six month period, to 1,054 deaths, according to the U.S. Embassy estimate, (Tutela Legal, the Salvadoran Catholic Church and Amnesty International document 2,527 deaths or disappearances in the same period, making the total for the last four years more than 38,000); and

Whereas, the U.S. has deployed combat troops in Honduras and three task forces led by the carriers *Ranger, Coral* and the battleship *New Jersey* off the Nicaraguan coasts; and

Whereas, direct U.S. intervention in the internal conflicts in Latin America has led to the imposition of brutally repressive regimes in those nations (e.q. Nicaragua, 1933; Guatemala, 1954; Chile, 1973);

Therefore, we call for the following actions:

(1) Cease all U.S. military aid to Cental America;

(2) End U.S. "covert" destabilization efforts against Nicaragua;

(3) Grant extended voluntary departure status to Central America refugees until they can safely return to their homelands;

(4) Make human rights a priority in the formulation of your policy toward all of the nations of Central America; and

(5) Support the proposals of the Contadora Group.●

A TRIBUTE TO MARIUS GALLAGHER

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to today call attention to a great citizen in my district, Marius Gallagher. Since moving into the Garfield Ridge community 25 years ago, Marius has helped our area in many ways. He served as president of the Garfield Civic League for 7 years, and as president of the Garfield Ridge Council of Organizations for 3 years. Gallagher has led a ceaseless battle for the comfort and safety of his neighbors.

Marius Gallagher has won numerous awards in the past 15 years. He was named the 23d Ward Patriot and Minuteman of the Year, and has been cited by the Rhine VFM Post, Garfield Ridge Chamber of Commerce and the Greater Midway Community and Development Committee. Marius has also won the "Ray McDonald Community Achievement Award."

It is with pride that I introduce into today's RECORD a newspaper article printed when Marius Gallagher received the Ray McDonald award.

Marius Gallagher's community involvement and dedication to improving the quality of life in the 23rd Ward are two reasons why he has been selected as March's recipient of the Ray McDonald Community Achievement Award.

Gallagher, the youngest of 13 children, was born in Gillespie, Illinois. One year later, the family moved to Chicago where he attended St. Dorothy's Grammar School and Carlinville Community High School. He also attended Wilson Jr. College but had to quit after one semester to help support his family. He was drafted by the United States Army in 1942 where he served as a staff sergeant until 1946. During his four year shift in the service, he earned an army degree as a diesel electric engineer.

For the past thirty years, Gallagher has been employed as a construction electrician. He has been involved in the construction of schools, hospitals, factories, high rise buildings and single family homes. "Every day is different—it's still a learning experience on the job," Gallagher stated.

Twenty-five years ago Gallagher moved to the Garfield Ridge community where he immediately proceeded to join the Garfield Civic League. He served as president of this organization for 7 years. He also had the distinct honor of serving as president of the Garfield Ridge Council of Organizations for 3 years. Gallagher has been constantly involved in community affairs such as the unending battle with aviation officials regarding the use of Midway Airport. His number one concern has always been the safety of his neighbors.

In the past 15 years, Marius Gallagher has received his fair share of awards. He has received the outstanding civic leader award from the Garfield Ridge Civic League, Council of Organizations and Kiwanis Club. In addition he was also honored as the 23rd Ward Patriot and Minuteman of the Year. His numerous community activities have also earned him citations from the Rhine VFW Post, Garfield Ridge Chamber of Commerce and the Greater Midway Community and Development Committee.

One of Marius Gallagher's proudest moments took place approximately 15 years ago when he and a friend by the name of Norman Middle saved a man's life. Gallagher and his friend were visiting a local establishment when a fire started in the basement of the structure. Instead of leaving the premises, Gallagher and Middle checked to make absolutely sure that everyone else was safe. It was during this search that they ran across a gentleman overcome by smoke laying upstairs. With Middle's assistance Gallagher carried the man from the burning building. His civic duty, has truly run the gambit.

In summing up why he became involved in community affairs, Gallagher simply stated: "My main goal has always been to make this the finest neighborhood in the City of Chicago." The Midway Sentinel believes he has accomplished his goal.●

MICHIGAN UNEMPLOYMENT ABOVE NATIONAL AVERAGE

HON. HAROLD S. SAWYER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, my State of Michigan has one of the highest unemployment rates in the Nation—way above the national average. This situation has caused great suffering for thousands of residents in my State. Recently, I became aware of a job-training demonstration program for minority youth that would have been ideal as a first step in our efforts to get this critical jobless situation under control. But, with an apparent lack of regard for our serious problem, every Michigan city was overlooked for participation in this program.

I am incensed by the fact that a State with such a great need for job-training is not even considered. On July 13, the entire Michigan delegation joined me in sending a letter to both the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Samuel Pierce, and the Secretary of the Department of Labor, Raymond Donovan, requesting an explanation for why not one Michigan city was chosen and why unemployment was not the criteria used in the selection process.

Yesterday, HUD finally responded to our inquiry and this morning Members of the delegation joined in a news conference to express our dissatisfaction with their reply. The letter explained that—

> Emphasis was placed on the expected capacity of the local community, represented by its public housing authority, private industry council and city government, to effectively manage and coordinate a flexible initiative. Cities with histories of strong training experience, good cooperation between public an private sectors, strong CETA-PIC's which would continue under the Job Training Partnership Act, JTPA, or fast developing JTPA-PIC's, were added to cities with good to excellent public housing management. Unemployment was not a primary determinant . . .

I am amazed that any job-training initiative would fail to consider unemployment as a primary criteria for selecting participants. This program most certainly should have been targeted for cities with high unemployment and specifically for those areas with serious minority youth unemployment problems.

It is distressing to me that HUD and this administration have acted this irresponsibly. This problem has been remedied for the future with an amendment we had tagged on to the HUD authorization bill for fiscal year 1984, which requires the HUD Secretary to use unemployment as the principal criteria in selecting participants for job-training programs. Unfortunately, this amendment will have no affect on this situation. We, the Members of the Michigan delegation do not plan to give up. We will continue our fight by taking our case to the White House.

Job creation has been an issue of the top-most priority for this administration. HUD's failure to consider unemployment and in turn overlooking every Michigan city for this demonstration program is a critical error that could have serious repercussions.●

UKRAINIAN PRISONER OF CONSCIENCE, OSKANA MESHKO

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I sent a letter to Secretary General Andropov—cosigned by 100 of my colleagues in Congress—which expresses our deep concern for the health and safety of the Ukranian prisoner of conscience, Oskana Meshko. This urgent appeal requests that Oskana be spared her final year in exile due to her age and failing health, and be allowed to return with her son and his family to Kiev.

Oskana Meshko is now in her second year of exile after being sentenced on July 3, 1981, to 6 months in a labor camp and to 5 years of internal exile in Siberia. The charges brought against her were "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" Mr. Speaker, if the truth be known her only crime was the founding of the "Ukrainian Public Group To Promote the Helsinki Accords," and her fervent appeals on behalf of her son, Oleksander Serhiyenko, a political prisoner who was sentenced in 1972 to 7 years of prison and 3 years of internal exile.

Mr. Speaker, this courageous woman of 78 years is deserving of the attention of my colleagues. In 1976, Mrs. Meshko suffered a heart attack during a police search of her apartment. During the course of one of the repeated, lengthy interrogation sessions that Mrs. Meshko has undergone, she had to receive medical attention for her heart. She also suffers from hypertension, glaucoma, and rheumatism.

While in exile, Mrs. Meshko is being forced to live under circumstances which aggravate her heart condition, and endanger her life. No medical care is available in Ayan, the remote village where she is exiled, and her heart condition prevents her from flying to the nearest medical center. There are no local doctors to aid her, and prescriptions cannot be filled since there are no drugs available in Ayan.

Mrs. Meshko detailed some of the harsh conditions she faces in a 1981 letter:

> I live in total isolation. The winters are harsh and the townspeople warn me that I won't make it through them. I have encountered three problems: lack of firewood, water and food. When the snowstorms come, they will block the roads, and if one ventures out it is impossible to find the way back home. Although the grocery store is not far, no one will help me, no one will come with supplies.

Food is in short supply in Ayan, and is often heavily salted, thus aggravating Mrs. Meshko's health problems. She is frequently isolated for days by severe storms, and the authorities have informed her that she must wait 2 to 3 years for a telephone, leaving her without any way to get help in an emergency. Mrs. Meshko has been aided by her son who was also exiled to Ayan. However, her son's 10-year sentence was to be completed today, Aug. 4, 1983. He must leave Ayan for the sake of his wife, who has been ill since her last pregnancy, and for the sake of his son and his 1-year-old daughter. The end of his exile will leave Mrs. Meshko's totally isolated.

When Mrs. Meshko's son leaves there will be no one to chop the wood which supplies the only heat during the brutal Siberian winter. There will be no one to help her in the event of an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, in this later period of her life, it is Mrs. Meshko's greatest wish to return home and be spared her final years in exile. According to article 100 of the Soviet Corrective Labor Code, convicted persons who suffer from chronic illnesses may be freed from serving the full term of their sentences. Therefore, in consideration of this exceptionally harsh situation, the letter I sent today asks that Oksana be allowed to return home with her son and his family to Kiev.

I want to thank the 100 Members who cosigned my letter. We can only hope and pray that this request be given prompt and appropriate consideration by the Soviet authorities.●

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN AND HELEN SULLIVAN ON THEIR 40TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. and Mrs. Sullivan who will be celebrating their 40th wedding anniversary on Saturday, August 20, 1983.

The family is the cornerstone of our great Republic. The strength of our society rests upon the stability of the family to endure the trials which life places before it. To maintain any relationship over a long period of time demands patience, understanding, respect, and the ability to return to the core of love upon which that bond was first established. It is not always an easy task. The Sullivan's deserve to be proud of this accomplishment.

John and Helen met in 1942 during the war and were married the following year in Camden, S.C. The Sullivans have been blessed with three sons: John, Jr., Michael, and Russell. The Sullivans are symbols of stability in the community. John has served as Charles County Commissioner for 8 years and worked 20 years for Freestate Business Machines. Helen retired in 1981 after 30 years of devoted service with the Department of Agriculture.

I am proud to know John and Helen and to represent them in Congress. I hope that our colleagues will join us, Mr. Speaker, in the celebration of their anniversary and the many fruitful years ahead.●

RESCUER MAKES SELF KNOWN AFTER ALMOST 40 YEARS

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an act of bravery and heroism that has gone unrewarded for almost 40 years.

On December 18, 1944, a plane of the 20th Air Force, 73d Wing, 498th Bomber Group, 875th Bomber Squadron crashed into a service gasoline area on the island of Saipan after a bomb run over Nagoya, Japan. Mr. Murray Juvelier, a radar operator on the downed aircraft, describes what happened next:

When the plane finally settled on the ground, I found myself pinned under the wreckage with a heavy smell of gasoline. It was quiet, and all I could hear was myself yelling for help.

Out of nowhere, someone was pulling wreckage off me and I was freed. I probably was in shock, but I can still hear this voice yelling, "Let's go before it blows." This soldier then started to help the others get out. My wounds were not disabling, so together we helped some of the others get out of the wreckage. I passed out, and the next thing I remembered was waking up at the base hospital.

Upon release from the hospital, Mr. Juvelier was transferred to the island of Guam, and despite repeated attempts, he was unable to discover the name of his courageous rescuer. In May of this year, however, at a military reunion, Mr. Juvelier was approached by a man who shook his hand, gave him a big hug, and said, "I guess you made it after all. If you were as heavy then as you are now," the stranger continued, "I never would have gotten you out of the plane."

The name of this hero is Robert Evans; he was then a sergeant in the Army Air Corps, with the 500th Bomber Group Z Square No. 3. His selfless act of heroism in saving another man's life at the risk of his own is a splendid example of the spirit that makes us all proud to be Americans.

I have added my voice to that of Mr. Juvelier in requesting that the Secretary of the Army take prompt action toward awarding an appropriate medal of honor to Mr. Evans, who has never sought any kind of recognition or acclaim for his heroism. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that although 40 years have passed, all of my colleagues will agree that it is never too late to reward such a splendid display of personal courage.●

A PARADISE FOR SPIES

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, "a paradise for spies" that is what Japan has been called regarding Soviet espionage activities. Last week Japan's Foreign Minister, Shintaro Abe, linked the flow of Japanese high technology to the Soviet Union with that country's military build up. Japan, the Minister said, must consider measures to restrict the transfer of high technology to the Soviets. Mr. Abe did not, however, spell out a plan to achieve this objective.

The similarities between certain American and Soviet weapons clearly means that someone is not minding the storehouse of advanced Western technology. Abe said he cannot deny allies' allegations that such high technology outflows have led to Soviet military expansion. As a member of the free world Japan must consider restrictions on the transfer of high technology, he said. The Foreign Ministers' speech did not mention what steps Japan would take to correct this problem.

Japan's problem is also a problem for the United States. When the House returns in September it will consider H.R. 3231, amendments to the Export Administration Act of 1979. This is the statute which regulates and licenses the export from the United States of militarily sensitive technology. The problem the House will examine is whether or not to eliminate the licensing of U.S. high tech exports to Japan and several Western European countries. Their export control systems do not do the job of forestalling Soviet acquisition of advanced technology.

The countries of the NATO Alliance and Japan are members of an informal coordinating committee known as Cocom. It establishes guidelines for the export of high technology to the Soviet bloc and other Communist countries. But Cocom's guidelines are just recommendations to participating governments. Cocom guidelines are not legally binding or enforceable on any country. The Export Administration Act Amendments, reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, proposes to eliminate the U.S. licensing of exports to Cocom. The argument in favor of eliminating licenses is based on the premise that member countries of Cocom are now effectively controlling sensitive exports to Communist countries. The evidence does not support this assertion. The Foreign Minister of Japan seems to agree.

Eliminating the requirement for export licenses to Cocom countries will seriously endanger U.S. efforts to raise the level of national export controls. The Japanese Foreign Minister did not deliver his speech because the United States was contemplating relaxing export controls. Warnings from the United States about the Soviet campaign to acquire Western technology no doubt contributed to Mr. Abe's speech. Last June, a Soviet diplomat was expelled from Japan for attempting to obtain confidential information from a computer software company.

High technology has become a very popular term. Exports of high technology are considered by some to be a panacea from our trade deficit. A sense of balance is sorely needed. America is not in the business of selling its most advanced science and technology on a first-come, first-serve basis. U.S. companies should have every opportunity to sell advanced goods and technology to our major allies and trading partners. But we also need a control system to insure that our research laboratories do not contribute to the development of Soviet weaponry.

The Export Administration Act is one tool to inhibit the sureptitious acquisition by the Soviets of Western technology. Export licensing among Cocom countries is an important device to monitor shipments and to identify exporters who would sell products, either directly or indirectly, to our adversaries around the world.

When the Export Administration Act comes before the House, there will be an opportunity to strengthen U.S. export controls and to begin the process of improving the export control system of our allies. When these objectives become a reality, there may be a diminished need for licensing exports among our partners in Cocom. Until that time, we should retain and improve the export licensing process.●

TRIBUTE TO LT. COL. GUION S. BLUFORD, JR.

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, the upcoming STS-8, the eighth launch of the space shuttle and the third launch of the spacecraft, *Challenger*, is a particularly special one to minorities because the mission will include Lt. Col. Guion S. Bluford, Jr., the first black American to orbit into space. Those of us in the Congressional Black Caucus regard his inclusion in this space mission as significant because he serves as a role model for young blacks that through dedication and hard work they, too, can explore the universe. As America's first black male astronaut, Bluford rightfully views himself as "a pacesetter * * * a guy who's setting the pace for the (black) people who are going to fly behind me."

The 4-day shuttle mission is scheduled to be launched on August 30, 1983 from Kennedy Space Center, Fla. Lieutenant Colonel Bluford will have the primary responsibility for deploying an important commercial satellite for the Government of India. He will also help conduct an experiment to separate live, human and animal cells for biomedical research, and will assist Comdr. Richard H. Truly during the shuttle's ascent and descent.

Presently serving in the U.S. Air Force, Bluford graduated from Penn State University in 1964 as a distinguished Air Force ROTC graduate.

He attended pilot training at Williams Air Force Base, Ariz. and received his pilot wings in January 1965. He then went to F-4C combat crew training in Arizona and Florida and was assigned to the 557th Tactical Fighter Squadron.

In July 1967, he was assigned to the 3630th Flying Training Wing, Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex., as a T-38A

instructor pilot. He served as a standardization evaluation officer and as an assistant flight commander. In early 1971, he attended squadron officers school and returned as an executive support officer of the deputy commander of operations and as school secretary for the wing.

In August 1972, he entered the Air Force Institute of Technology residency school at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. Upon graduating in 1974, he was assigned to the Air Force Flight Dynamics Laboratory at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, as a staff development engineer. He served as deputy for advanced concepts for the aeromechanics division and as branch chief of the aerodynamics and airframe branch in the laboratory. Bluford has written and presented several scientific papers in the area of computational fluid dynamics.

He has logged over 3,200 hours jet flight time in the T-33, T-37, T-38, F-4C, C-135, and F-5A/B, including 1,300 hours as a T-38 instructor pilot. He also has an FAA commercial pilot license.

In January 1978, Bluford was selected as an astronaut candidate by NASA. He became eligible for assignment as a mission specialist on space shuttle flight crews upon completion of a 1 year training and evaluation period making him eligible for assignment as a mission specialist on future space shuttle flight crews. He has worked with the remote manipulator system, spacelab-3 experiments, shuttle systems, Shuttle Avionics Integration Laboratory (SAIL), and the Flight Systems Laboratory (FSL) while completing various assignments within the Astronaut Office at the Johnson Space Center.

As chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, I am proud to salute this black American male pioneer for his important contributions to America's space program. Historically, black Americans have made many important scientific and technological contributions to our Nation. Guion Bluford continues this fine tradition and I speak for all 20 black men and women of the caucus in wishing him and his fellow crew a safe and successful voyage.●

USER FEES FOR COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH PLANT AND ANIMAL QUARANTINE

HON. EDWARD R. MADIGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have this date introduced, by request, draft legislation forwarded by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Speaker.

A brief explanation of the bill is contained in the following excerpt from the Secretary's letter accompanying the draft legislation:

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to charge for services rendered in connection with: (1) laws intended to prevent the introduction or dissemination of plant and animal pests and diseases into or throughout the United States; (2) laws intended to assure the humane care, treatment and transportation of animals; and, (3) actions taken by the Secretary of Agriculture to assure compliance with import requirements imposed by foreign countries to prevent the spread of plant and animal pests and diseases from the United States. The bill provides that the money collected shall be credited to accounts which the Secretary may establish for these activities, and shall remain available until expended. The costs incurred for the performance of activities under section 1 of the bill will be charged to such accounts. Under present procedures, all costs of such activities are paid from appropriated funds; authority to recover costs for these activities is very limited. We believe all costs associated with these programs of the Department should be borne by the persons who receive the services provided, and not by the general public.

Enactment of this bill is consistent with the President's Fiscal Year 1984 budget and would reduce outlays by some $3.6 million annually. The proposal is also consistent with the recent General Accounting Office recommendations (see GAO report CED-81-49).

Upon enactment, fees totalling about $3.6 million annually would be implemented to recover the costs of issuing phytosanitary certificates and testing, certification, inspection, and quarantine of animals and plants for import and export.●

SOVIET OFFICIALS CHARGE LEV ELBERT WITH POSSESSION OF HASHISH

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I have learned the distressing news that Soviet officials are charging Lev Elbert, a Jewish refusenik who has applied to emigrate to Israel without success since 1976, with possession of a large quantity of hashish.

This represents a despicable attempt by the Soviet prison authorities to heap even further harassment and suffering on the Elbert family whose only crime is the desire to be reunited with their family in Israel, and practice their religion and culture in a free society. They cannot do so in Kiev.

Prior to this trumped-up charge of hashish possession. Lev Elbert had already been sentenced to a 1-year prison term for refusing to be inducted into the Soviet Army.

I call upon the Soviet Government to bring an immediate end to the persecution of Lev Elbert and his family, and to allow the family to emigrate to Israel. There can be no legitimate reason for them not to do so. Continued intransigence in this matter will demonstrate incredible cruelty on the part of the Soviet authorities, and sets back their quest for legitimacy in the international community.●

A TRIBUTE TO ED SOLTIS

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I call attention to a model citizen in the Fifth Congressional District of Illinois, Ed Soltis. Ed has been working to help the southwest side of Chicago for over 42 years. His involvement in church and community activities has enriched all of our lives.

Ed has devoted his life to the service of others. To commemorate that service, as well as the 50th wedding anniversary that Ed and his wife, Mary, celebrated on July 1, I introduce into today's RECORD a newspaper article published when Ed was awarded the "Ray McDonald Community Achievement Award":

The Midway Sentinel proudly salutes Edward Soltis as our monthly recipient of the Ray McDonald Community Achievement Award. This recognition is given to Ed for his dedication and outstanding achievements in our community.

Soltis, a life long resident of the Southwest side, attended and graduated from Dunbar Township High School. He also received two years of technical training in machine shop at Tilden Tech.

His community involvement began 42 years ago with the St. Symphorosa Holy Name Society and Ushers Club. He served as president of both organizations. In addition he served on St. Symphorosa's Supper Club as chairman of the sick and vigil committee. Recently, the Supper Club honored him as their Outstanding Senior Citizen for his personal achievements for the good of others. He was also selected as Grand Marshall of the St. Symphorosa International Day.

Besides his many church activities, Ed is also a honorary life member of the Knights of Columbus and past member of the Senior Hearts Athletic and Social Club; he also held an active membership in the Clearing Civic League and was an original board member for the Lech Walesa Memorial Committee.

One of Ed's primary objectives in life has always been to get involved and help as many people as possible. He has devoted his life and time for the good of others.●

TRIBUTE TO GARY FREEMAN AND DANNY COREY

HON. LARRY J. HOPKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to

pay special tribute to two men, who without a thought to themselves, risked their lives to save the lives of two others. The brave gentlemen I want to recognize are Mr. Gary Freeman of Irvine, Ky., and Mr. Danny Corey of Mount Sterling, Ky.

On May 4, the lives of the Larry Graves family were in danger when their small boat capsized while plunging through swollen waters over one of the Kentucky River dams. Danny Corey and Gary Freeman, who were fishing offshore, jumped in the water and pulled Darren and Pamela Graves to safety. Danny Corey's unselfish act is especially noteworthy—he cannot swim.

Unfortunately, Larry Graves, 34, of Lexington lost his life in this tragic accident. The life of a lost loved one is irretrievable, yet it is due to the courage of these two men that Mrs. Pamela Graves and her 11-year-old son, Danny, are alive today.

On behalf of the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Kentucky, I would first like to extend my deepest sympathies to the family and friends of Larry Graves' family.

But, I also want to extend my admiration and appreciation to Gary Freeman and Danny Corey for risking their lives to save others.●

SECOND CONGRESSIONAL ART EXHIBITION OPENS

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last night more than 30 talented young artists gathered with Members in our Cannon tunnel to officially open An Artistic Discovery—the national exhibition of winning artworks by high school students from congressional districts across the country.

Participating in the ribbon cutting ceremony were Speaker TIP O'NEILL, Minority Leader BOB MICHEL, and Capitol Architect George White, whose staff spent tireless hours transforming the walls of our tunnel into an artistic showcase. The evening's festivities were enhanced by a special reception hosted by the The Allstate Foundation.

Sponsored by the Arts Caucus, An Artistic Discovery is one of the most unique expressions of bipartisan support for the arts. The outstanding collection of paintings, drawings, and prints brings together the activities of 208 House Members who conducted local art competitions which involved thousands of high school students.

My own district winner is Robin Corcoran who attends Bayport-Blue Point High School. Her pastel, entitled "Robin's Nest," took more than 1 month of constant work and dedication to complete.

The successful completion of An Artistic Discovery has demonstrated the wonderful opportunity we have, as Members of Congress, to encourage the creative talents of today's youth. The national exhibition of winning artworks is a tribute to the great creative spirit of young people throughout the country.●

CENTRAL AMERICA—A PETITION FOR PEACE

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this brief moment to make my colleagues aware of the ever-increasing evidence demonstrating the public's opposition to the Reagan administration's strong-arm tactics in Central America.

This newly expressed disenchantment does not come from some liberal, Democratic interest group, nor is it a product of some random survey conducted by the liberal press. This new evidence emanates exclusively from within the walls of Congress, from a group of young women and men who play an active role in the legislative process every day. I am, of course, speaking of the congressional interns. These young people come to Washington from many universities and colleges and work for Congressmen and Congresswomen of diverse political philosophies. They come to learn about our political process and to become more aware of world events that directly affect our lives.

Mr. Speaker, in the past several weeks a bipartisan group of 30 interns has organized, drawn up a petition, and as of this morning, secured hundreds of signatures in support of a statement that calls for an abandonment of the regressive, frightening policies currently employed by the President in Central America. They propose in lieu of these policies a more sane, more equitable, more humane, progressive approach to this troubled war-torn region. The proposals include a call to end U.S. covert destabilization efforts against Nicaragua, grant extended voluntary departure status to Central American refugees, make human rights a priority in the formation of policy toward all of the nations of the region, and to support the proposals of the Contadora group. I think all of these suggestions are vitally important for the expeditious resolution of the current turmoil. We should give aid to governments which assist their people with education, which provide them with sufficient food, and which respect human rights. I condemn continued U.S. aid to governments and guerrilla groups which murder and terrorize the citizens of these nations.

I salute these young interns for standing up for peace and justice and advocating a sound democratic solution to the problems in Central America. If there is a group that can provide well-informed, sound advice to the U.S. Congress on behalf of the vast majority of young Americans, that group is the congressional interns. I hope that all of my colleagues heed this advice, and begin to seek peaceful, and diplomatic solutions to the problems of Nicaragua, El Salvador, and all of Central America.

The petition follows:

AUGUST 1983

President REAGAN:

During the past few years, the political instability in Central America has raised serious concerns in our country. We, the undersigned Congressional and Government Interns, wish to express our opposition to several of your Administration's actions in Central America:

(1) Increased U.S. military involvement;

(2) U.S. military support of governments that blatantly violate fundamental human rights;

(3) U.S. violation of national and international laws; and

(4) continuing U.S. efforts to overthrow the Nicaraguan Government.

These actions are increasing the probability of direct U.S. troop involvement in a full-scale regional war.

We believe these actions stem partly from a misguided perception of events in Central America as little more than an outgrowth of the international competition between the United States and the Soviet Union. This overemphasis on the Soviet influence in Central America diverts attention from the history of political and economic oppression which is the principal cause of the current unrest. Moreover, your Administration's policy in Central America is consistent with your actions that increase the disparity of wealth between the rich and poor peoples of the world.

Believing that these policies can only undermine both the interests and ideals of the United States and that negotiations provide the best means to the establishment of peace, democracy and justice in Central America, we therefore present the following petition:

Whereas the Reagan Administration has violated the Boland Amendment, the Rio Treaty, the O.A.S. Charter, and the U.N. Charter by providing military assistance to groups attempting to overthrow the Nicaraguan Government; and

Whereas in the past six months the political death toll in El Salvador has risen twelve percent over the previous six month period, to 1,054 deaths, according to the U.S. Embassy estimate, (Tutela Legal, the Salvadoran Catholic Church and Amnesty International document 2,527 deaths or disappearances in the same period, making the total for the last four years more than 38,000); and

Whereas the U.S. has deployed combat troops in Honduras and three task forces led by the Carriers *Ranger, Coral* and the battleship *New Jersey* off the Nicaraguan coasts; and

Whereas direct U.S. intervention in the internal conflicts in Latin America has led to the imposition of brutally repressive regimes in those nations (e.g. Nicaragua, 1933; Guatemala, 1954; Chile, 1973);

Therefore, we call for the following actions:

(1) Cease all U.S. military aid to Central America;

(2) End U.S. "covert" destabilization effort against Nicaragua;

(3) Grant extended voluntary departure status to Central American refugees until they can safely return to their homelands;

(4) Making human rights as priority in the formulation of your policy toward all of the nations of Central America; and

(5) Support the proposals of the Contadora Group.

Sincerely,

Name Permanent Address

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Please return to Clayton Lewis in 1206 Longworth (5-3106) by 10 on Friday, August 5.●

SOVIET DAY OF SHAME

HON. JOHN R. KASICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago, on August 21, the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies brutally invaded Czechoslovakia after that country had taken modest steps toward democratization. The Soviets forced the Czechoslovakian Government to curtail its liberal reforms and submit to Soviet occupation. After overrunning the brace but overmatched resistance by the Czechoslovakian people, the Soviets quickly reestablished the Communist Party as the supreme authority in the state. Tragically, the Soviet armies which entered Czechoslovakia in 1968 remain there today.

The Czechoslovakian Government has suffered a history of Soviet intervention. After World War II, a democratic Czechoslovakia fell victim to a communist coup in 1948 which transformed the country into a full-fledged satellite of the Soviet Union. During the coup, Communist militia occupied the headquarters of democratic parties and arrested many democratic members of parliament. The Communist leaders then called a session of the parliament and voted themselves "legally" into power. For the next 20 years, the Czechoslovakian Communist party exercised, with Moscow's blessings, a dictatorial authority characterized by terror, purges and the repression of basic liberties. The Czechoslovakian people yearned for liberal reform.

Finally, in 1968, the will of the people triumphed under the new leadership of Alexander Dubcek. Dubcek and his supporters inaugurated a series of sweeping reforms designed to liberalize Czechoslovakian life and politics. The Czechoslovakian Communist Party released the press, radio, and TV from 20 years of rigorous censorship. The party established a program which guaranteed the basic freedoms of speech, press, assembly, organization, and religious worship while assuring all people the free choice of work, fair trial, personal property rights, and the right of free movement inside and outside the country. The brutal Soviet invasion and subsequent repression eliminated the innovative Czechoslovakian program which was eventually to be incorporated into a new constitution. In their dissent, the freedom-loving Czechs encountered mass arrests, union purges, and religious persecution.

The 1968 Soviet invasion clearly violated the U.N. Charter and all tenets of international law. The Soviet Union invaded a defenseless state to wipe out a resurgence of human freedom. Our government condemns the Soviet's continued occupation of Czechoslovakia as a crime against a small country's right to determine its own aspirations and destiny. Therefore, on August 21, the people of the United States as well as freedom loving citizens throughout the world shall join the Czechoslovakians held in the iron grip of Russian totalitarianism in recognizing the Soviet Day of Shame. We support them in their determined resistance against Soviet repression, and will continue to do so until justice prevails.●

WAND-TV CELEBRATES 30 YEARS

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago this month, an important newcomer came to the Decatur, Ill., area. WAND-TV, then known as WTVP-TV, went on the air.

It marked a new era of entertainment, education and public service for the people of central Illinois. As an affiliate of the American Broadcasting Co., WAND has brought in a variety of entertainment programs. Yet, its strength is the same today as it was 30 years ago—local programing.

Over the years, the local product has evolved from live entertainment and children's programing to outstanding news and public service offerings.

Nine years ago this summer, Decatur suffered through a series of disasters, beginning with a tornado followed by severe flooding and climaxed with a terrible explosion in the railroad yards.

WAND was on hand at all these tragedies, providing viewers with firsthand reports and reliable information. In the case of the railroad yard explosion, covering the story involved personal risks for the reporters and camera operators.

This spirit of dedication extends beyond the station's news department and can be found in every section of the station's operation from advertising and promotion to the technical workers that keep the station on the air.

Quality programing, quality employees and quality management have been the standard at WAND. Together, these elements guarantee public service to the Decatur community and the continued success of channel 17.

Local television stations are special. They ask to come into their viewers' homes several times a day. If they provide a needed service, if they present professional, tasteful and quality programing, they are invited back.

This is the truest measure of their success.

WAND has been dropping by and being invited back for 30 years and will likely continue to do so as long as Americans watch television.

It is with great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I call your attention and that of my colleagues to this distinguished broadcast operation.●

NEWHALL'S WESTERN WALK OF FAME

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the American West and its cowboy are one of our most cherished and enduring traditions.

The cowboy was the good guy. Tall in the saddle, leathered and gritty, he was indomitable, courageous, upright, loyal, and romantic.

This man, his lure and lore, his spirit and great heart, his adventures are enshrined in the western Walk of Fame in downtown Newhall, Calif.

Sitting comfortably in the middle of the Santa Clarita Valley, like an old cowhand on a familiar saddle, Newhall has a western movie history that is unmatched anywhere.

The legacy began many years ago with William S. Hart, the great

cowboy star of the silent movie era who shot many a stirring epic on his Newhall ranch. He was the first of many western stars to ride off, victorious and undaunted, into the Santa Clarita Valley sunset.

Following his trail were men whose names create such strong images in the memory that you can hear the hoof beats, smell the sage, and see the bandit spin down into the dust. They were Tom Mix, Tex Ritter, Hoot Gibson, and Gene Autry. Each of these film legends had ranches, shot movies and bad guys in the hills and arroyos of Newhall.

The western Walk of Fame is young, yet it already holds a special place in the hearts of all valley residents and western fans everywhere. Begun 3 years ago by the Downtown Newhall Merchants Association, the Walk today honors, with bronze saddles, William S. Hart, Tom Mix, Gene Autry, Tex Ritter, Rex Allen, and Eddy Dean.

The grand tradition continues on August 27 when Roy Rogers, Dale Evans, Pat Buttram, Claude Akins, Tex Williams, and Andy Jauregui are enshrined in the Western Walk of Fame.

Who doesn't know of Roy Rogers, king of the cowboys. He is a star of radio and television and more than 100 movies. For 12 consecutive years, Roy Rogers was the No. 1 western star.

Dale Evans is the much-admired queen of the West and the first woman to be honored in the Western Walk of Fame. She is an actress, singer, author, and rodeo star who has more box office records at State fairs and rodeos than any other female star.

Pat Buttram, longtime favorite humorist, is Hollywood's sophisticated rube and Gene Autry's sidekick. A talented comedian and raconteur, he starred in the television series, "Green Acres."

Tex Williams, is a singer, songwriter, band leader, and beloved Newhall resident. Tex literally capitalized on his Capitol record hit, "Smoke, Smoke That Cigarette." Overnight he was in demand for movies, appearances in nightclubs, and television shows.

Claude Akins is a star of numerous films, stage appearances, and television shows, most recently "B. J. and the Bear" and "Sheriff Lobo." Akins is a representative of the new West and a versatile performer.

Andy Jauregui is a pioneer rancher in the Santa Clarita Valley, a champion calf and steer roper, a bronc and bull rider, a stock and stuntman, a member of the Cowboy Hall of Fame. He is a personification of the history of Newhall and its western traditions.

These heros of the not-so-wild West are beloved by all for what they have given to each of us—joy, laughter, and diversion—and for what they represent—honor, virtue, strength.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to play a small role in this contemporary western story of affection and recognition.●

ROLLAND TRUMAN, AN EMINENT MAGISTRATE, RETIRES HIS ROBE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Honorable Rolland Truman, Superior Court Commissioner and judge pro tem of Los Angeles County. A close friend of mine for more than 35 years, Rolland recently decided to retire his robe. He leaves his position with the Superior Court in Long Beach after 15 years of dedicated service to the people of Los Angeles County and the State of California.

Rolland has been licensed to practice in the State of California since 1942, and before the Supreme Court of the United States since 1957. He earned both his Bachelor of Arts and Juris Doctorate degrees from the University of Southern California. He quickly established himself as an incisive, yet fair attorney prior to assuming his place on the bench. There he earned the respect of both his colleagues and the attorneys who practiced before him because of his unwavering commitment to the spirit of justice.

In addition to his service on the bench, Rolland has devoted himself to community service. He has assumed leading roles in such organizations as the Church State Council for the Western United States, the Kiwanis Club of Long Beach, the American Bar Association, the American Arbitration Association, and as both a member of the board of directors of the White Memorial Medical Center and first president of the Angeles Nature Club. Like his father before him, Rolland also is extremely active in the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and all who attend the Bellflower-Lakewood Seventh-day Adventist Church know him well.

Born in 1912, Rolland is the son of Dr. and Mrs. A. W. Truman. He is a native of Loma Linda, Calif., and with his wife, Laurel A. Weibel-Truman, M.D., has raised an outstanding family of seven. Together with my wife, Lee, I would like to extend to Rolland and Laurel Truman, and their seven children: Rolland, Jr., Norris, Tracy, Tammy, Trina, Trent, and Tricia, our wishes for a future as bright as their past is memorable.●

POWELL MOORE

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to ask our colleagues to join me in expressing our deep appreciation and gratitude to the Honorable Powell Moore, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations. He will be leaving the Federal Government during the upcoming August recess.

Prior to his appointment as Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Powell A. Moore was Deputy Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs and was in charge of White House relations with the U.S. Senate. He was appointed to that position on January 19, 1981 by President-elect Ronald Reagan and was sworn in on January 21, 1981.

Before joining the White House staff, Mr. Moore had been engaged for the previous 6 years in governmental relations and Washington representation as a consultant for a variety of corporations and associations.

He began his Washington career in 1966 as an aide to the late Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia. When Senator Russell died in 1971, he became Deputy Director of Public Information for the U.S. Department of Justice and later served in the Office of Legislative Affairs at the White House under Presidents Nixon and Ford. When he left the White House staff to enter private business in 1975, he was a Deputy Special Assistant to the President.

Mr. Moore and his staff have been of great assistance to the Foreign Affairs Committee on many matters during the past 2 years. Whether the problem was legislative, constitutent-related, or a matter of translating the complexity of the Department of State, Powell was always helpful. His integrity, loyalty, dedication, and good humor will be missed. I wish him the best as he takes on important responsibilities in the private sector.●

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON WOMEN'S BUSINESS OWNERSHIP

HON. JIM MOODY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill, with 30 of my colleagues, to establish a bipartisan National Commission on Women's Business Ownership.

Specifically, the Commission will be charged to:

Recommend ways to enhance procurement opportunities for women business owners;

Recommend ways to enhance access to credit for women in business;

Review of the role of the Federal Government in promoting ownership of businesses by women, and suggest possible changes;

Recommend new private sector initiatives in management and technical assistance to women business owners; and

Review and recommend improvements in data collection procedures on various aspects of women-owned businesses, including existing Federal initiatives and Federal procurement policies.

The creation of a bipartisan Commission on Women's Business Ownership is timely and worthwhile. In addition, this bill is an important step toward recognizing the contributions of and correcting the problems faced by women business owners.

We hope our colleagues will support this important measure.●

NUCLEAR FREEZE AND MX MISSILE

HON. JIM BATES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, this House was engaged in a history making event as we debated the nuclear freeze and the MX missile. There was a great deal of good that came from these debates: We cleared the air of national defense policy and made it possible to examine the consequences of our decisions on our Nation's defenses.

During the coming recess I think it is of critical importance for us to listen carefully to our constituents. We will find that while a strong national defense is supported throughout this land, a wasteful, unnecessary and essentially ineffective new missile system has no support.

It is a rather well-known fact that many of the designers of the MX have turned against it, and the certainty that this missile—still with no reliable basing mode—is ineffective is shared by most of our constituents.

This is a time of reconstruction in America. We must begin to mend our internal fences and to repair the damages of the recession. It is not a time for foreign adventures, unnecessary new missiles, and high budget deficits.

If we listen carefully to our constituents in the coming months we will find a concern for our Nation's defenses that does not include bringing us again to the brink of nuclear war.

We should take heart from the opinions and feelings of our constituents. We will find among them this summer the sustinence and strength to wholly and finally condemn the MX missile where it belongs—where all wasteful, unnecessary, and ineffective ideas belong.●

THE AUTOMOBILE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 1983

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, encountering problems with a new automobile is so common an experience that we have given a new meaning to the word "lemon"—which means not only the delicious fruit grown in my home State of California, but it now also means an automobile with persistent mechanical problems—a dud.

This lemon phenomenon is not unique to any particular make or model of automobile, and it occurs as frequently with foreign as with domestic cars. The only common element is the frustration shared by those who have the misfortune to end up with a lemon.

For most Americans the purchase of a car is one of the largest investments they will make. For this reason it is essential that purchasers of automobiles be assured that effective remedies are available if a vehicle turns out to be defective and cannot be repaired.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to address these problems, I have introduced the Automobile Consumer Protection Act of 1983. This act requires that the manufacturer, agent, or authorized dealer responsible for a new defective automobile correct such defects that may occur within the first 2 years or 18,000 miles of operation of the car, whichever comes first.

The automobile purchaser will be entitled to a refund or a new vehicle from the manufacturer after making four unsuccessful attempts to repair a specific defect or after the vehicle has been out of service for 30 or more days during the 2-year period or the first 18,000 miles of use. Before consumers can receive a new car or a refund, however, they must use the manufacturer's arbitration program that may be available.

Existing Federal legislation is inadequate to provide automobile consumers the assurances they need. The Uniform Commercial Code, the standard legislation that has been adopted by almost all States, provides only implied warranties and gives no guarantee to a car owner that he can recover his costs if the purchase turns out to be a lemon.

The Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act sets minimum standards for warranty protection, but this legislation is generally not applicable for purchasers of lemons. Automobile manufacturers and dealers are essentially free to impose any restrictions or limitations they desire upon warranties.

In order to fill this gap in Federal consumer protection, a number of States have passed so-called lemon laws. At present some 15 States—including my home State of California—have enacted such legislation.

While there is some similarity in these State laws, they differ in important respects. The Constitution clearly vests in the Federal Government the authority to regulate commerce among the States. In the critical area of automobile consumer protection, it is important and appropriate for the Congress to establish uniform and unambiguous national standards.

At present we have a patchwork of State laws. The same automobile if purchased in one State is covered by a warranty which can differ significantly from what is available if the automobile were purchased in another State. This invites confusion and works to the serious disadvantage of consumers.

The legislation I have introduced is intended to remove that confusion and establish uniform and consistent warranty protection. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.●

ON THE FEDERAL INSECTICIDE, FUNGICIDE, AND RODENTICIDE REFORM ACT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am joining my friend and colleague, the Honorable TOM HARKIN, as a cosponsor on the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Reform Act, a comprehensive bill being introduced today. This bill addresses a number of complex and important shortcomings in the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, FIFRA, the basic environmental statute regulating pesticides.

Over the last 3 years, the Department Operations, Research, and Foreign Agriculture Subcommittee, which I chair, has conducted an extensive series of legislative and oversight hearings on the pesticide program. This spring the House passed a simple 1-year reauthorization bill, H.R. 2785. During consideration of this bill, the subcommittee decided to defer action on major substantive amendments and pass out the simple reauthorization. The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Reform Act is one of the measures the subcommittee will take up in the fall. In addition, the

subcommittee will be considering H.R. 3254, the Pesticide Import and Export Act of 1983, introduced on June 8, 1983, by Chairman HEFTEL. This bill addresses a range of important issues regarding the export of pesticides from the United States.

The effectiveness and efficiency of the pesticide program both need to be improved. I am hopeful that additional resources provided in next year's budget and administrative initiatives underway at the Environmental Protection Agency will be constructive in this regard. I do believe that the research compiled by the Department Operations, Research, and Foreign Agriculture Subcommittee over the last 3 years clearly supports the need for some fundamental reforms in the statute. I think the major issues are well known and documented at this point, and that the subcommittee will be able to pass some positive initiatives.●

ENTERPRISE ZONES—HELP FOR DEPRESSED CITIES

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 1955, the Enterprise Zone Employment and Development Act, of which I am a cosponsor.

The enterprise zone is an important concept which may help us make substantial progress in our cities, offering significant advantages to firms that create jobs in depressed areas. Among the incentives are an additional investment tax credit for investment, along with a jobs credit equal to 10 percent of payroll. Within the zones, the creation of foreign trade zones is encouraged and capital gains taxes for investors are eliminated.

The enterprise zone is the most exciting proposal that has come forward in recent years to deal with the problem of the inner city and the structurally unemployed. Zones would be in areas where conventional policies should be supplemented. These zones would be ideal locations to test more innovative approaches without dismantling programs which are already effective.

A major economic problem of the inner city has been the poor sustaining power of businesses—especially small businesses. Small firms are the most effective creators of jobs in the economy, and provide the type of jobs most suitable to the inner city. They bring together the talent of the entrepreneur and the young, unskilled work force, and they play a crucial role in the community. But these types of enterprise need the assistance of the Federal Government to thrive. The best way to encourage this sector is to remove the obstacles to the entrepreneur and to give these individuals the kind of business climate that will provide the incentive to take the risks necessary to succeed.

For example, neighborhood residents have been eager to put their own time, effort, and limited resources into housing rehabilitation if given the encouragement to do so. Under the enterprise zone concept, the Federal Government would help fuel such incentive if it created a climate in which essentially self-help projects would be more likely to succeed.

Another positive aspect of this proposal is that local and State governments must initiate the process by applying for zone status. They must also submit a zone contract which outlines the steps that State and local governments plan to take to improve the climate for job creation, economic growth, and community development within the zone. Using this information, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would designate up to 25 zones a year for 3 years, giving preference to zones with the worst economic conditions, the best contracts, and the broadest community support.

The basic attractiveness of this idea is that instead of thrusting a predesigned package on a community, it would put into place a program which local officials and residents can mold to fit their area's specific economic and social circumstances. My district, for example, which is comprised mainly of diverse ethnic groups, is in need of this type of new, fresh approach to help their depressed living areas. Development along our Hudson County waterfront must be encouraged to spread inland to these neighborhoods.

The enterprise zone concept marks a new direction for inner city revitalization. But unlike many new ideas, enthusiasm for this proposal is not limited to one political group or lobby. The proposal has drawn support from a wide range of individuals and organizations who are rarely in agreement on any aspect of public policy. These groups include the National Urban League, the League of Cities, the Congressional Black Caucus, and the Heritage Foundation.

The enterprise zone approach appeals to me, as one of those who has been directly involved for many years in central city projects. The zone concept seeks to stimulate local projects and commercial risk taking by removing financial and regulatory obstacles. It provides a climate that will make it more likely that community initiatives and businesses will succeed. It will not guarantee success, but it will help reduce the number of needless failures.

I am also enthusiastic about this proposal because, although the original concept came from Europe, the enterprise zone is a very American approach to inner city problems. The citizens of other countries look to their central government to deal with the problems of society. However, in this country, local problems have often effectively been dealt with on the local level, with a combination of individual initiative and community dedication. The enterprise zone is strongly within this tradition. It is a new and innovative proposal, capable of making the scarred inner cities open neighborhoods, capable of inviting urban pioneering.

Mr. Speaker, with over 130 cosponsors, the Enterprise Zone Act has broad, bipartisan support. Some States, including New Jersey, are considering enterprise zone legislation at the State level. In a time when direct Federal funding is being cut for all types of aid to those in the inner cities, we need to act quickly to pass and implement this important proposal.●

THANK YOU, JOAN

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today, one of the most versatile and effective administrative assistants who has ever served a Member of Congress is leaving the Hill. This person, who during the past several years has served as my administrative assistant, is Joan Kunkel.

I would like, for a moment, to relate how Mrs. Kunkel has served so many Members of Congress other than myself over the years. She began her career on the Hill in 1951 with Senator Holland serving in various capacities in his office and eventually becoming his office manager. In 1966, she began working for Representative William Fittes Ryan of New York. The late Representative Ryan has been called "the conscience of Congress" and I believe this statement has some bearing on the quality of his employees—people like Joan Kunkel. After working for Representative Ryan, she served Representative John Dow and then our colleague WILLIAM LEHMAN.

In 1976, when I was first elected to the House, Joan Kunkel was instrumental in setting up my office. Since then, in her capacity as my administrative assistant, she has excelled in every area.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Joan Kunkel is highly regarded by all those she has come into contact with over her years of service in the Congress. She will be sorely missed by myself,

and my staff. On behalf of all of us who have had the pleasure of working with Joan Kunkel, I would like to wish her the best of luck in her future in the Sun, and to extend to her many thanks.●

A TRIBUTE TO RAOUL WALLENBERG ON HIS 71ST BIRTHDAY

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in tribute to a courageous and honorable man, Raoul Wallenberg, whose contribution to humanity by risking his own life to rescue 100,000 Hungarian Jews during World War II has not gone unnoticed. He listened to his conscience, and I believe his humanitarian acts are an inspiration to future generations to continue the moral fiber of our society. If Raoul Wallenberg is alive today somewhere in the Soviet Union, he is celebrating his 71st birthday. Recognizing Wallenberg's heroic deed of saving Jews from Nazi extermination, Gov. Bob Graham of Florida has designated today as "Raoul Wallenberg Day."

It is painful to remember the Nazi genocide that was committed against a people, but by recalling the sacrifice of this man, we may prevent this atrocity from happening again.

By 1944, 5 million Jews had already met tragic deaths in the gas chambers, concentration camps, cattle cars, and through an inhumane and cruel process called selection. The Nazis had invaded Hungary in the early spring of 1944 with the intent of liquidating the last remaining Jewish community in Europe.

At the request of the American Government, neutral Sweden sent Wallenberg to conduct a rescue mission. Wallenberg printed his own Swedish passports and defied the Nazis daily by following death marches, pulling people off cattle cars, and constantly endangering his own life.

Wallenberg was taken prisoner by the Soviet military and imprisoned at the war's end in 1945. Soviet officials denied allegations that they were holding Wallenberg prisoner, but in the 1950's they claimed he died in 1947. Yet, as recently as 1974, prisoners who have escaped from the Soviet Union and reached the West claim that Wallenberg was still alive in 1974. And there is the belief that he might yet still be alive. Wallenberg was made an honorary citizen of the United States in 1981 for his bravery and humanitarianism.

His commitment as a "righteous Gentile" will be remembered solemnly by millions of people of all religions who hold him up as a symbol of humanitarian values and the embodiment of all the best within us.●

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to applaud the National Association of Realtors for its testimony before the Ways and Means Committee last week. I wholeheartedly agree with its evaluation of the administration's fiscal policy. The association fears, as I do, that if the administration persists in its present course of irresponsible spending the economic recovery we now enjoy will soon dissipate.

The administration's promises to balance the budget simply do not square with its actions bolstering defense spending. We can slash that defense budget by $30 billion without adversely affecting our national strength. The money the administration wants to drain into expensive defense weaponry is sadly misdirected. That weaponry cannot be adequately and economically tested, housed, or maintained. The country should direct its efforts instead toward refurbishing its conventional force. This approach would not strain the Nation's economy. More importantly, it would give us an alternative to nuclear confrontation should a situation calling for military intervention arise.

As the realtors pointed out, more money in government means a shortage of investment funds, resulting in high interest rates. Owning a home has become an impossibility for many Americans. Clearly, American economic policy has gone awry. If Congress does not rein in this administration's burgeoning defense budget, and do it soon, we will bear the responsibility for snuffing out this country's first real chance at economic vitality to come along for many years.●

AMERICAN GOLD STAR MOTHERS

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to grant a national charter for the American Gold Star Mothers, Inc. This legislation will bestow upon this important organization one of Congress' highest honors of recognition.

Since its founding in 1928, the American Gold Star Mothers has helped many families overcome the grief from the loss of their sons or daughters who died in the line of duty in the Armed Forces in World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, Vietnam, and other strategic areas. Through service, this organization perpetuates the memory of those soldiers whose lives were sacrificed in our Nation's wars. Its work exemplifies an inspirational height of patriotism as it continues to fight to protect the rights for which their sons and daughters bravely fought.

The American Gold Star Mothers has been operating under a charter from the District of Columbia since January 5, 1929. It is apparent after 54 years of service that this organization is serving an important purpose to the many mothers who lost their children in the line of duty. As a nonpartisan and nonprofit organization, the American Gold Star Mothers has demonstrated its commitment to public service. It is open for membership to all eligible women and is not discriminatory on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin.

The American Gold Star Mothers desires to help its members and their dependents in the presentation of claims to the Veterans' Administration and to assist in other ways. The support from this group has enabled many families to adjust to a way of life without their loved ones as well as provide them with an outlet to promote peace and goodwill. Its success can be seen by the activities of the 34 State network of the American Gold Star Mothers. In Tennessee we have an active chapter in Knoxville, and organizational efforts in other Tennessee cities.

I strongly believe that this nationwide organization which strives to promote the patriotic ideals of public service should be granted a national charter. This legislation is important because the charter given them the honor of congressional recognition.

These women have given our country their greatest treasure, and Congress should do no less than award them with the status they so richly deserve. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.●

ONE SOLUTION TO THE DRUNK DRIVING EPIDEMIC: RAISING THE DRINKING AGE TO 21

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, in the last year, I have become very active in Congress in some of the States, and with private organizations in promoting legislation addressing a very serious problem in this country: teenage drunk driving.

Do you know what I have learned? Although drunk driving is a problem that pervades all age groups of our licensed population, it is especially severe for teenagers. The combination of learning to drive, youthful risk taking, and drinking makes auto accidents the No. 1 killer of teenagers in this country.

I have made a real effort to draw attention to this problem, and to persuade the Congress to make a strong statement in support of a uniform national policy, enacted individually by the States, because 23 years in the education field has taught me a valuable lesson—that the youth of this country are valuable to our future beyond description.

Most of the ones so tragically affected by teenage drunk driving are just beginning to understand who they are and what they want out of life. They have parents. They have interesting, and chances are, innocent faces. They listen to stereos. They play video games. They compete on athletic fields and in the classroom. They talk for hours on the telephone. And all too many of them can only be remembered now—remembered by the high school graduation picture hanging on the living room wall of a family that will never be the same. Remembered for who they were, and sadly, for who they might have been.

Consider these tragic facts: Our teens make up only 8 percent of the population, drive only 6 percent of the highway miles, yet they are involved in 15 percent of fatal alcohol-related accidents.

Of the 25,000 persons who die each year in drunk driving accidents, 5,000 are teenagers and almost 35 percent are between the ages of 16 and 24.

In fact, 14 teenagers die each day in drunk driving accidents.

On the other hand, many innocent persons driving within the limits of the law are also affected by teenage drunk drivers. All too often we forget about the teenager who caused someone in the other car to lose his or her life, and then was forced to live with that stigma and terrible nightmare long afterward.

In response to this, I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 23, a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the minimum age for drinking and purchasing alcoholic beverages should be raised to 21.

This resolution reflects one of the key recommendations of the Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving. Senator ARLEN SPECTER has introduced the companion resolution, and so far 15 U.S. Senators and 74 Members of Congress have cosponsored the measure. It has received endorsements from Cabinet members Elizabeth Dole the Secretary of Transportation, and Margaret Heckler, the Secretary of Health and Human Services. In addition, the following organizations have endorsed "21" nationwide: Mothers Against Drunk Drivers (MADD); the National Transportation Safety Board; the National Safety Council; the American Medical Association; the American Automobile Association; the Epilepsy Foundation of America; the International Chiefs of Police; and many insurance groups, including the Alliance of American Insurers, the Government Employees Insurance Company (GEICO), the National Association of Independent Insurers, and the Professional Insurance Agents.

I hope we see passage of House Concurrent Resolution 23 in this session of Congress, for I really do believe this is an issue which all the State legislatures should take up in their respective chambers—particularly at a time when many of the States are reviewing their educational systems. If we really are in pursuit of excellence in education, then we cannot overlook teaching our teens as well as our youngsters about the problems of alcohol abuse, and the dangers posed by drinking and driving.

Recently, I received yet another letter of support for this idea, from the President of the American College of Preventive Medicine, which I commend to my colleagues' attention.

AMERICAN COLLEGE
OF PREVENTIVE MEDICINE,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1983.

Hon. WILLIAM GOODLING,
Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GOODLING: On behalf of the American College of Preventive Medicine, I am writing to indicate endorsement of H. Con. Res. 23, now pending in the House Committee on Judiciary and on Public Works and Transportation.

As I am sure you are aware, the College has been quite active in the area of automotive safety and is particularly supportive of measures that would lessen the severe toll of automobile accidents on our nation's youth. We therefore congratulate you on your introduction of H. Con. Res. 23 and are pleased to lend our support to it.

Sincerely,

JEFFERSON C. DAVIS, M.D.,
President.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to explain my vote against the U.S. quota increase to the International Monetary Fund. Before I was sworn in as a Member of the House, I knew that the vote on reauthorizing our commitment to the IMF would be one of the most important decisions I would be called upon to make. Also, I want to apprise my colleagues of the fact that I have struggled with this question in an attempt to do what is right.

When I return home every weekend and travel throughout my district, I talk with people at the various events I attend. Invariably, someone will ask me to vote against increasing our quota to the IMF. Many are employed, but most are unemployed or know someone who is jobless. What is most alarming is that those who are unemployed fear that they may never regain what they lost. Some lost jobs, others lost homes and automobiles, while a few lost their spouses through divorce or separation. All lost some of their pride, dignity, and self-worth.

I represent a politically, economically, and geographically diverse district, yet the people I spoke with all agreed, regardless of their philosophy, that the IMF quota increase constitutes a bailout of the large banks. They do not understand why a handful of banks will lend their savings and investments to developing nations when so many in the United States need so much. They have asked me to explain how a bank can foreclose on their neighbor's home, but not foreclose on a nation that has overborrowed. Realistically, these people understand that it is not practical to foreclose on a nation, but when they see their neighbors in trouble it is difficult for them to think in practical terms.

Last February the House Banking Committee held hearings on mortgage foreclosures. One of my constituents offered testimony before that August body. He related the suffering he and his family experienced when their home was foreclosed upon. Most disconcerting to me is the fact that after he left his home, there was no one willing to buy it. It sat there abandoned and deteriorating.

While my constituent was still in the room, something occurred that I shall never forget. It was one of the darkest moments in my career as a public servant. A member of the Banking Committee expressed profound sympathy for those losing their homes, but he said the Congress had a much more compelling issue to tackle. That issue was the U.S. quota increase to the International Monetary Fund. No concern was shown for those who had lost their homes. Initially my constituent was stunned, then he and his companions grew angry. I had a difficult time trying to explain how my colleague could make a statement of that magnitude. I will never understand why those words were stated in that situation at that particular time. On that day the reputation of the House suffered.

In the late spring, the House passed a bill designed to assist those threatened with foreclosure. Yet the same voices who showed disregard for their fellow citizens attempted to road block

this legislation. The administration was later successful in stopping their important legislation. Those actions made me wonder how the administration and some Members of this body could with good conscience, advocate spending $8.4 billion for bailing out foreign debtor nations and their lenders, while they refuse to spend one cent to help the unemployed with some type of mortgage assistance.

Those same parties urge spending billions of dollars for nations abroad—many dollars of which have financed excess foreign steel capacity that has contributed to high unemployment—yet they refuse to mitigate the damage being done to our own citizens.

Our priorities are not clearly defined. We have churches dispensing soup, and food banks doing land office business in my district and elsewhere in western Pennsylvania. I cannot justify an affirmative vote on an IMF quota increase that would spend billions for banks and debtor nations, while doing little that directly serves the interests of my constituents in need. Why are we enacting legislation that helps others when so many of our own are suffering in these trying economic times?

Let me make it clear that I am not thinking in a vacuum. I acknowledge the reality of interdependence. I appreciate the importance of international liquidity, a structured balance-of-payments system, a free and fair world trading system and the jobs it creates, but could it be that if we spend billions on the IMF, we will be undercutting our own industrial base? Perhaps even the economic recovery? And our own needy citizens?

Many have submitted that a bailout will help create jobs because the increased funding will promote exports. Furthermore, I am aware that one in six jobs relies on exports. Those assertions are difficult to dispute. Nonetheless, no one has shown me how many individuals will return to work if we vote to increase the U.S. quota. Some may benefit, but how many currently unemployed will be helped? If new jobs will be created, what mechanism exists to assist those who require retraining?

I would like to close by adding that for all the talk about how crucial this bill was, no one from the IMF, the Treasury, or the banking industry even offered to brief me, or my staff on this issue. With such a presumptious and cavalier attitude on behalf of some of legislation's advocates, and the points I made above, I had no choice but to oppose the quota increase.●

CONGRESSIONAL ART COMPETITION WINNERS

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the winners of the Congressional Arts Caucus (CAC) Competition in the Seventh District of Illinois and congratulate these fine students for their participation in this project which stresses the importance of the arts in our schools.

As an executive board member of the CAC, I am pleased at the artistic excellence demonstrated by all of the students who participated in "An Artistic Discovery."

Willie Lee Brown, of Chicago, a student at Westinghouse High School, was selected the winner with a drawing titled, "The Drape." His art work is presently on display in the corridor leading to the Capitol along with 200 other works of art by high school students chosen from art competitions held throughout the country.

I would also like to take note of the other participants in this contest: Bernice Maria Rajewski, Trinity High School; Selena Beaty, Constance James, and Carla Davis, Westinghouse High School; Efrain Santiago, Rezin Orr High School; Anthony Moore and Fancher Camerou, Austin High School; Anthony Maldoneldo, Ray Graham Training Center and Pedro Morales of Clemente High School.

All of these young men and women of my district deserve a warm round of appreciation for their efforts, enthusiasm, and ability. Their efforts demonstrate again the greatness of today's youth and their pride in their home town and our Nation.●

LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH A MINIMUM, MANDATORY PRISON SENTENCE FOR THE USE OF ARMOR-PIERCING, HANDGUN AMMUNITION DURING THE COMMISSION OF A FELONY

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would establish a minimum, mandatory prison sentence for the use of armor-piercing, handgun ammunition during the commission of a felony.

Many of us are aware of the serious threat that the existence of armor-piercing, handgun ammunition poses for our Nation's police officers specifically and citizens generally. Although the Treasury Department has made some progress in persuading manufacturers of these bullets to restrict their sales to legitimate law enforcement agencies, so-called cop-killer bullets remain available for use on the streets.

Currently, there are approximately eight different types of handgun ammunition which the FBI has identified as armor piercing. Each of these, when fired from certain handguns, is capable of penetrating the most common form of soft body armor worn by more than half of all U.S. law enforcement personnel today. For this reason, various police associations, gun control groups, and other organizations have pressed for Federal legislation which would ban the manufacture, importation, and sale of these bullets.

The problem with any such legislation, however, it that it requires a definition of the term "armor-piercing ammunition." For over a year now, the Treasury Department's Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms has been working on such a definition with little or no success. Treasury has found that there is no simple dividing line between bullets that will penetrate body armor and bullets that will not. Thus any attempt to define these bullets runs the risk of also outlawing many types of ammunition commonly used for sporting purposes.

The legislation I am introducing today is a reasonable, interim solution to the problem we face. This bill would establish a minimum, mandatory prison sentence of 5 years for the use of armor-piercing, handgun ammunition during the commission of a felony. Such an added penalty would go a long way toward eliminating the use of this ammunition for nonlegitimate, criminal purposes. And should not that be our primary consideration until such time as an accurate and acceptable definition of these bullets can be developed?

What is unique about this bill is that the 5 year sentence would be required only when it can be proven that the ammunition used in the crime can penetrate body armor when fired from the defendant's handgun. Thus, even if the ammunition used in the crime is capable of piercing armor when fired from another type of firearm, the defendant would not be subjected to an additional 5 year sentence. This provision is very important absent a definition of armor-piercing ammunition.

Every minute that we wait to deal with this serious problem increases the chance that one of our hard-working police officers will unnecessarily be injured or killed. This bill puts a strict penalty on the books for those criminals convicted of using armor-piercing bullets in the act of a felony. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.●

MERITORIOUS RECOGNITION OF SBA GOLD MEDAL WINNER

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 4, 1983

● Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, on July 29, 1983, the Small Business Administration (SBA) Chicago office presented Mr. H. Sam McGrier, assistant director for management assistance with the 1983 Gold Medal award because of his "outstanding service" to the public and "exemplary achievements" in the area of management assistance.

Mr. McGrier, a resident of Broadview, Ill., located in my district was awarded the highest honorary recognition presented by the SBA. The Gold Medal is given to those employees whose meritorious adhievements are so exemplary that they are determined to merit recognition above and beyond that provided by other performance or incentive awards. This award recognizes the employee who has made the most significant overall contribution of all nominations submitted for agency consideration.

Mr. McGrier, with almost 10 years of Federal service was cited for his exemplary performance and significant contributions to the efficiency, effectiveness, and economy of government operations. Deserving recognition was given to his leadership, creativity, and resourcefulness in providing management counseling and training to the small business communities of Illinois.

Mr. McGrier has previously served as the executive vice president of the Chicago Economic Development Corp. and as a personal banking officer at the Madison Bank & Trust Co. He was also appointed by me as a delegate to the White House Conference on Small Business.

Congratulations Mr. McGrier.●